A

DISCOURSE

Proving The

Divine Inſtitution

OF

Water-Baptiſm:

Wherein The

Quaker-Arguments

Againſt it, Are

COLLECTED and CONFUTED.

With as much as is Needful concerning

The Lord's Supper.

[By Chas Leslie]

By the *Author* of, *The Snake in the Graſs.*

If ye Love me, keep my Commandments, Joh. xiv. 15.

LONDON:

Printed for *C. Brome*, at the *Gun*, at the *Weſt-End* of St. *Pauls*. *W. Keblewhite*, at the *White Swan*, in St. *Pauls Church-Yard*. And *H. Hindmarſh*, at the *Golden Ball*, over-againſt the *Royal Exchange*, in *Cornhill*. M.DC.XC.VII.

XUM

THE PREFACE

CONTAINS.

I. A *Short Proof for* Infant Baptiſm.

II. *The ſeveral ſorts of* Contemners *of* Baptiſm *amongſt us.*

III. *The* Presbyterians *in* Scotland.

IV. *In* Ireland.

V. *In* England.

VI. *Too many of the Communion of the Church of* England.

VII. *Whence this Diſcourſe uſeful to others beſides* Quakers.

VIII. *The Particular Occaſion of Writing this Diſcourſe.*

The

The Contents of This Discourse.

Sect. I. That *Matth.* xxviii. 19. was meant of *Water-Baptism.* Page 1.

II. That *Christ* did Practise *Water-Baptism.* 2. That the *Apostles* did it after *Him.* 3. That the *Catholick Church* have done it after *Them.* *p.* 3.

III. That *Baptism* must be *Outward* and *Visible,* because it is an Ordinance appointed whereby to *Initiat* Men into an *Outward* and *Visible Society,* which is the *Church.* *p.* 7.

The Arguments of the Quakers *against the* Outward-Baptism.

IV. 1. That the *Baptism* Commanded *Matth.* xxviii. 19. was only the *Inward,* or *Spiritual Baptism.* *p.* 11.

V. 2. That *Water-Baptism* is *John*'s Baptism, and therefore Ceased. *p.* 12.

VI. 3. That *Christ* and the *Apostles* did Baptize with *John*'s Baptism. *p.* 14.

VII. 4. That *Paul* was not sent to Baptize, 1 *Cor.* i. 14. 17. *p.* 21.

VIII. 5. That *Baptism* is not the putting away the Filth of the *Flesh*; but the Answer of a Good *Conscience,* 1 *Pet.* iii. 21. Therefore that it is not the *Outward* but the *Inward Baptism,* which the *Apostles* Preached. *p.* 33.

IX. 6. That there is but *One Baptism, Eph.* iv. 5. therefore not both *Outward* and *Inward.* *p.* 35.

X. 7. That the *Outward Baptism* is to be left behind, and we to get beyond it, *Heb.* vi. 1. *p.* 38.

XI. 8. That there are no *Signs* under the *Gospel.* *p.* 45.

XII. The *Conclusion.* Shewing the *Necessity* of Water-Baptism. *p.* 59.

Erratum. P. 5. l. 14. r. *Act.* x. 47.

There will soon be Published a *Discourse,* by the same *Author,* shewing whom *Christ* hath *Ordained* to *Administer* the *Sacraments* in His *Church.* And another, wherein it is prov'd, That the Chief of the *Quaker-Heresies* were *Broached,* and *Condemned,* in the Days of the *Apostles,* and in the first 150 Years after *Christ.*

XUM

AS Baptiſm *is putting on* Chriſt, *giving up our Names to Him*; *being Admitted as His* Diſciples; *and a* Publick Profeſſion *of His* Doctrin: *So the Renouncing of our* Baptiſm, *is a* Publick *a* Diſowning *of Him*; *and a Formal* Apoſtaſy *from His* Religion.

Therefore the Devil *has been moſt buſie in all ages (but has prevailed moſt, in our latter Corrupt times) to Prejudice Men, by many falſe Pretences, againſt this* Divine Inſtitution. *Having been able to perſwade ſome quite to throw it off, as* Pernicious *and* Hurtful: *Others to think it only* Lawful *to be done, but to lay no great ſtreſs upon it, and ſo uſe it, where it is Enjoined, as a thing* Indifferent. *Others deny it to* Infants, *upon this only Ground, That they are not ſuppos'd Capable of being Admitted into the* Covenant *of* God, *which He has made with Men: For, if they are Capable of being admitted into the* Covenant, *there can be no Reaſon to deny them the outward* Seal *of it.*

But this being Foreign to my preſent Undertaking, which is to Demonſtrate to the Quakers *the Neceſſity of an* Outward *or* Water-Baptiſm, *in the General (for as to Perſons capable of it, we have no Controverſie with thoſe who deny it to All) therefore, I have not digreſs'd into another Subject, which is, that of* Infant Baptiſm, *in the following* Diſcourſe.

1. *Yet thus much I will ſay of it, in this place, That* Infants *are Capable of being admitted into the* Covenant, *and therefore that they cannot be Excluded from the outward* Seal *of it. The Conſequence the* Baptiſts *cannot deny. And that they are Capable, I thus prove. They were Capable under the* Law, *and before the* Law, *of being admittted as Members of the* Covenant *in* Chriſt *to come, made with* Abraham, *by the* Seal *of* Circumciſion, *at the Age of* Eight Days: *And therefore there can be no Reaſon to Exclude them from the ſame Privilege, to the ſame* Covenant, *now that* Chriſt *is come; unleſs* Chriſt *had debarr'd them from it: The* Law *ſtanding ſtill, as it was, where He has not* Alter'd, *or* Fulfill'd *it. But He has not debarr'd them. Nay, on the contrary, He has yet further confirm'd their being within the* Covenant. *He called a* Little Child, (Mat. xviii. 2, 3, 5.) *and ſet him in the midſt of His* Apoſtles; *and Propoſed him as a Pattern to* Them, *and to all* Adult *Chriſtians. And ſaid, That none ſhould* enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, except thoſe who ſhould become as little Children. *And that whoever did Receive a* Little Child *in* His Name, *did Receive* Chriſt *Himſelf. And* (ver 10.) in Heaven, their Angels (*ſaith Chriſt*) do always behold the Face of my Father which is in Heaven. *And therefore He bids us* Take heed that we deſpiſe not one of theſe Little Ones; *by which term tho* Adult *Perſons are ſometimes meant, yet in the Texts before quoted, it is expreſly apply'd to* Little Children. *And what greater* Deſpiſing *of them can be, than to Reject them as no Members of* Chriſt's Body, *and conſequently unworthy of the* outward Seal *of His* Covenant? Chriſt

Chriſt *was* diſpleaſed *with His* Diſciples (Mar. x. 14.) *for hindring* young Children *to be brought unto Him. And will He be* pleaſed *with the* Baptiſts *for the ſame thing?* He took the little Children up in His Arms, put His hands upon them, and bleſſed them. *Did He* Bleſs *thoſe who were not* Capable *of being within His* Covenant? *He ſaid,* Of ſuch is the Kingdom of God, (*which is a term our* Saviour *us'd, to Expreſs the* Covenant *of the* Goſpel) *Are they not then within the* Covenant *of the* Goſpel? *The* Apoſtle *ſays, that where either of the Parents is a Chriſtian,* (1 Cor. vii. 14.) *the* Children *are* Holy: *That is, within the* Covenant *of* Chriſt. *And purſuant to this, when any man was Converted, his* Children *were* Baptized *with himſelf. This is the meaning of what we read ſo often in* The Acts, *that ſuch a Man was* Baptized *with his* Houſhold. *And it was the Cuſtom before with the* Jews, *that when they admitted any man as a Proſelyte to their Religion, they* Baptized *his* Children *with himſelf. Let this ſuffice for the preſent. And Proceed.*

II. *When* Rebellion *had fully compleated it ſelf, in the* Murther *of the King,* 1648. *It ſoon ſpawn'd a multifarious* Schiſm *of* 30 *or* 40 *different* Religions *in* England, *at the ſame time, of which Catalogues were then Printed, moſt of all theſe threw away* Baptiſm: *And threaten'd an immediate and total Overthrow of the* Chriſtian *Religion, in this* Iſland. *But, by the great Mercy of God, the* Reſtauration *of the* Church, *with the* King, 1660. *has extinguiſhed the very* Names *and* Memory *of theſe, all but* 4 *or* 5 *of the Principal* Sects. *The* Presbyterians, (*Mother of all the reſt*) Independents, Ana-baptiſts, Quakers, *and* Muggletonians. *I am told of ſome* Sweet-ſingers, *got up of late. But they are yet inconſiderable. They may Increaſe, and all the reſt Revive, if warm'd by a Plenitude of* Indulgence. *The* Socinians, *or* Unitarians, *are already got very high, who make nothing of the* Sacraments, *but as* In-effectual Forms. *So think the* Deiſts, *who pretend to higher Quality than theſe. And the* Latitudinarians *will quarrel with none of theſe. All* Deiſts *are* Latitudinarians; *and, tho' they deſpiſe* Baptiſm, *and all* Reveal'd *Inſtitutions, yet they can ſubmit to them, becauſe they are* Eſtabliſhed *by* Law, *as they would to any thing elſe, rather than loſe a* Penny, *or their* Eaſe. *But the* Quakers *and* Muggletonians *have (more ſincerely) Rejected* Baptiſm, *as not allowable, becauſe they think ſo.*

III. *The* Presbyterians, Independents, *&c. do indeed uſe* Baptiſm; *but as a thing ſo* indifferent, *that many of them will ſuffer a Child to dye without it, rather than Baptize it* Privately, *or not upon a* Sermon *or* Lecture-day, *or before* Sermon, *rather than after it; And an Inſtance can be given, ſince this late Eſtabliſhment of* Presbytery *in* Scotland, *of a Child who dyed in the Church, in* Sermon-time; *but the Miniſter ſuffered that, and the repeated Requeſts of the* Parents, *rather than go out of his wonted method of Baptizing* after Sermon, *he thought* Baptiſm *ſo little material!*

But

But the People being us'd to a greater veneration of Baptiſm, *under the* Epiſcopal *Adminiſtration, and taking the* Presbyterian *contempt of it ſomewhat uneaſily, the* Presbyterian *Miniſters there, to inſtruct them better, had publick Preachments, all over the Nation, to ſhew the no Neceſſity of the* Outward *or* Water-baptiſm. *I will not ſay the* English Presbyterians *go ſo far; they are one Degree further from the* League & Covenant. *I hear that they do now Adminiſter* Baptiſm Privately, *in and about* London. *Which the* Independents *do ſtill Refuſe, (I have it from ſome of themſelves) let the caſe be never ſo urgent, even tho' the child ſhould dye without it, before one of their* Sermon *or* Lecture-days. *As for the other* Sacrament *of the* Lord's Supper, *I hear that ſome* Independent Congregations *in* London *are come to uſe it* Monthly. *And the* Presbyterians *more frequently than they us'd to do; or than they do in other places. The frequency of* Communion *in the* Epiſcopal *Churches, in ſome manner forcing them to it, that their people might not think themſelves more neglected by them, than others are. But their own* Inclination, *and the* Value *they have for this* Sacrament *will better appear by their Behaviour while they had the Power in their own hands; and could* Dictat *to others, inſtead of* Following *or* Complying *with them. And during their* Government *in the late* Revolution, *tho' they did not down-right (as the* Quakers) *declare* War *againſt it, &* Extripate *it* at once; *yet they plainly ſeem'd to have had a deſign to have* Inch'd *it by Degrees out of the world, as far as it was in their power, by letting it fall into* Diſſuetude, *that ſo it might be* Forgotten, & Dye. *And they had almoſt Effected it, among thoſe Unhappy People that were led by them. For from the Birth of their* Covenant, *A. D.* 1638. *they had not this Sacrament in many* Pariſhes *in* Scotland, *ſome for* 10, *ſome for* 12, *ſome for* 15 *years; which was almoſt their whole* Reign. *And in the* Indulg'd *and* Conniv'd *at Pariſhes to the Year* 1683. *many perſons (who were not Debarr'd for any Exception againſt them) ſome of* 50, 60, 70, *and* 80 *years of Age, never receiv'd this* Sacrament *once in their lives: This I know from certain Information. And ſince their preſent Eſtabliſhment in this* Revolution, *their neglect of this* Sacrament *is likewiſe Notorious. Four Years after which,* viz. *in the year* 1693. *it had not been Adminiſtred in* Edenbrugh; *& but once a year, at the moſt, ſince. We may imagine then how it has been obſerved in the Country Pariſhes.*

IV. *The* Presbyterians *in the* North *of* Ireland, *are a* Sprig *of the* Scotch Covenant *Tranſplanted thither: Which in that change of Soile, has taken deep Root, and ſpread Intolerably. And the* Biſhop *of* Derry, *in his late Clear and Rational* Diſcourſe concerning the Inventions of Men in the Worſhip of God, *And* Two *following* Admonitions, *has made it fully appear, That not* One *in* Ten *of them do ever Receive this* Sacrament *in the whole Courſe of their Lives: And the reſt very rarely, even now ſince this laſt Revolution. And in the Former Revolution of* 41, *he gives Undenyable Inſtances, that in ſeveral Churches, even in* Dublin, *after the turning out of the* Epiſcopal Miniſters, *the* Lord's Supper

had

XUM

had not been Administred till the Restauration, 1660, that is, in some Churches for Ten, in some for Twelve Years together.

V. These Presbyterians in Dublin, and in the South and West parts of Ireland, were sent from England, and had learnt the Contempt of this Sacrament there. Where, even in Oxford, it was not Administred in the whole University, from the Ejection of the Episcopal Clergy, in the Year 1648. to the Restauration in 1660, as is observed in the Antiquit. Oxon. So that the Quakers have only taken that out of the way, which the Presbyterians had worn into Dis-use.

VI. And from all these Enemies, and the Subtle Insinuations which they have broached in Prejudice of Christ's Holy Institution of Baptism, and likewise of the Lords Supper (for both are slighted by the same Persons, and upon the same Grounds) it is to be feared, that several, even of the Church of England, have been wrought, tho' not into a Dis-use, or downright slight, yet into a less Esteem and greater Indifferency as to these Holy Sacraments than they ought; and consequently receive less Benefit by them; much less than if their Knowledge, and their Faith were better rooted, and more sublime. Nay, there is not any Degree of indifferency, but what is Culpable, in this Case; and may bring a Curse with it, instead of a Blessing: for, whatsoever, especially in Religious Worship, is not of Faith, is sin. And accordingly to our Faith, it is to us, in all our Performances of Religion.

VII. For all these Reasons, tho' this Discourse was wrote wholly on Behalf of the Quakers, yet, I hope, it will not be un-useful to many others, to see the strong Foundation, Great Necessity, and In-estimable Benefits of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, when Duly Administer'd, and Receiv'd with Full Faith and Assurance in the Power and Love of God, that He will not fail to assist His own Institutions, when we approach unto them, with sincere Repentance, and undoubting Dependance upon His Promises. And many of the Objections hereafter answered, tho' used by the Quakers, to Invalidate BAPTISM, are likewise insisted on by several of the Sects, which I have named above, to Lessen and Disparage it. In which sense, the following Discourse, tho' it respects the QUAKERS Chiefly, yet not them Only, for it contains the joint Arguments of all the several sizes of the Opposers, or Contemners of Baptism.

VIII. But as to the immediate Occasion, which engaged me in this Work, it was upon the Account of a particular Person, who had been Educated from his Childhood in the Quaker Principles, and Communion. And the Objections which are here considered against Baptism, are these which, at several conferences with other Quakers, to whom that Person brought me, were insisted upon. At length, after more than Twelve Months consideration of this single Point, and diligently Reading over, and weighing every particular, which Rob. Barclay had wrote, in his Apology, against the Outward, or Water Baptism, it pleased God so to open the Eyes, and perswade the Heart of this Gentleman, that, having Informed himself in the true Principles of the Christian Religion, as contained in our Church Catechism; he has lately with great joyfulness, and satisfaction, Received the Baptism of Christ, as Administred in the Church of England. And it was his Desire, that this Discourse (tho' wrote for his Privat Use) might be made Publick, in hopes, that it may have the like Effects upon others, as it has had upon himself, by the great Mercy of God. And I knowing several others who have of late been Convinced and Baptised, in the same manner, as this Gentleman; I have not Resisted his invitation to contribute my Mite towards the Recovery of so many Thousand Souls as now for 46 years, have thrown off the Sacraments of Christ's Institution: and thereby, as one main Cause, have left the Substance, even Faith in the Blood of Christ, outwardly shed for our Salvation, as I have else-where shewn. The Lord accept my mean Endeavours; and make them Instrumental to His Glory, and the Salvation of Souls. Amen.

XUM

A DISCOURSE, PROVING The DIVINE INSTITUTION OF WATER-BAPTISM.

SECT. I.

That Matth. xxviii. 19. *was meant of* Water-Baptiſm.

THE Words of the Text are theſe: *Go ye, therefore, and Teach all Nations, Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt.*

The *Quakers* will not own that the *Baptiſm* here mentioned was the *Outward*, or *Water-baptiſm:* Which I will endeavour to make very plain, that it was; and that in the firſt place,

From the *Signification* and *Etymology* of the word *Baptize.*

1. The word is a *Greek* word, and only made *Engliſh* by our conſtant uſage of it: It ſignifies to *Waſh*, and is apply'd to this *Sacrament* of *Baptiſm*, becauſe that is an outward *Waſhing.*

To *Waſh* and to *Baptize* are the very ſame; and if the word *Baptize* had been rendred into *Engliſh*, inſtead of, *Go and* BAPTIZE, it muſt have been ſaid, *Go and* WASH *Men, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt.* So that the outward *Baptiſm*, with *Water*, is as much here commanded, as if it had been expreſſed in *Engliſh* words, or as we can now expreſs it.

But becauſe the word *Baptize* was grown a Technical Term, in other Languages, whereby to expreſs the Holy Sacrament of *Baptiſm*, long before our *Engliſh* Tranſlation, therefore our Tranſlators did rightly retain the word *Baptize* in this Text, *Matth.* xxviii. 19. and in other Texts which ſpeak of that *Holy Sacrament*.

But in other places they tranſlate the word *Baptize*, as *Mark* vii. 4. *When they come from the Market* ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίσωνται, except they are *Baptized*, which we literally tranſlate except they *Waſh*. And in the ſame Verſe, βαπτισμοὺς ποτηρίων, &c. The *Baptiſms* of *Cups* and *Pots*, &c. which we tranſlate the *Waſhing* of *Cups* and *Pots*. And *Heb.* ix. 10. ſpeaking of theſe Legal Inſtitutions, *which ſtood only in Meats and Drinks, and divers Waſhings, and carnal Ordinances*, &c. the word which we here tranſlate *Waſhings*, is, in the Original, βαπτισμοῖς, *Baptiſms: In Meats and Drinks, and divers Baptiſms*. And in the *Vulgar Latin*, the *Greek* word is retained in both theſe Texts, Mark vii. 4. *Niſi Baptizentur, non Comedunt*. Except they are *Baptized*, *i. e. Waſh* their *Hands*, they eat not. And *Baptiſmata Calicum*, &c. The *Baptiſms* of *Cups*, &c. And *Heb.* ix. 10. *In Cibis & Potibus, & variis Baptiſmatibus*; i. e. *In Meats and Drinks, and divers Baptiſms*. So that it is plain that the word *Baptiſm*, and the word *Waſhing*, tho' not the ſame word, have yet the ſelf-ſame meaning.

2. It is true, that the word *Baptiſm* is often taken in a *Figurative* and *Allegorical* Senſe, to mean the Inward Baptism, the *Waſhing*, or *Cleanſing* of the *Heart*: But ſo is the word *Waſhing* alſo, as often, as *Jer.* iv. 14, *&c.* And there is ſcarce a Word in the World but is capable of many *Figurative* and *Allegorical* Meanings. Thus *Circumciſion* is very often us'd for the *Inward Circumciſion* or *Purity* of the *Heart*. And *Fire* is taken to expreſs *Love*, and likewiſe *Anger*, and many other things.

But it is a receiv'd Rule for the Interpretation of *Scripture*, and indeed of all other *Writings* and *Words*, that the plain *Literal* Meaning is always to be taken, where there is no manifeſt *Contradiction* or *Abſurdity* in it; as when a Man is ſaid to have a *Fire* burning in his *Breaſt*, it cannot be meant of the *Literal Fire*: ſo when we are commanded to *Waſh* or *Circumciſe* our *Hearts*,

Hearts, and the like. But, on the other hand, if any Man will take upon him to underſtand Words in a *Figurative Senſe*, at his own will and pleaſure, without an apparent Neceſſity from the *Scope* and *Coherence*, he ſets up to *Banter*, and leaves no *Certainty* in any *Words* or *Expreſſions* in the World. Therefore I will conclude this Point of the natural *Signification* and *Etymology* of the word *Baptize*: And, unleſs the *Quakers* can ſhew an apparent *Contradiction* or *Abſurdity* to take it in the *Literal Signification*, in this Text, *Matth.* xxviii. 19. then it muſt be meant of the OUTWARD WASHING or BAPTISM, becauſe that is the only *True*, and *Proper*, and *Literal* Signification of the Word.

And it will be further Demonſtrated in the next *Section*, that there can be no *Contradiction* or *Abſurdity* to take it in a *Literal* Senſe, becauſe the *Apoſtles*, and Others thereunto *Commiſſionated* by them, did Practiſe it, in the *Literal* Senſe.

SECT. II.

I. *That* CHRIST *did Practiſe* Water-Baptiſm. II. *That the Apoſtles did it after* Him. III. *That the* Catholick Church *have done it after* Them.

I. THat *Chriſt* did Practiſe *Water-Baptiſm*. It is written, *John* iii. 26. *And they came unto John, and ſaid unto him, Rabbi, He that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou bareſt witneſs, Behold, the ſame Baptizeth, and all Men come to Him.*

That this was *Water-Baptiſm* there can be no Doubt, becauſe,

1. The *Baptiſm with the Holy Ghoſt* was not yet given: For that was not given till the Day of *Pentecoſt*, fifty Days after the *Reſurrection* of *Chriſt*, as it is Recorded in the Second of the *Acts*. This *Spiritual Baptiſm* was promiſed, *John* xiv. 16, 26. xv. 26. xvi. 7. And the *Apoſtles* were commanded to tarry in the City of *Jeruſalem* till it ſhould come upon them, *Luke* xxiv. 49. 2. The *Quakers* allow that *John* did *Baptize* with *Water*, and there is no other ſort of *Baptiſm* here mentioned, with

which *Christ* did *Baptize*; and therefore, these *Baptisms* being spoke of both together, there can be no Reason to interpret the *one* to be with *Water*, and the *other* not. It is said *John* iv. 1. *The Pharisees heard that Jesus made and baptized more Disciples than John.* How cou'd the *Pharisees* hear of it, if it was not an *Outward* and *Visible Baptism?* For, as before is said, the *outward* and *miraculous* Effects of the *Baptism with the Holy Ghost* were not then given. And since it Was an *Outward*, it must be the *Water-baptism*, for there was *then* no other.

Obj. But the *Quakers* start an *Objection* here, That it is said *John* iv. 2. *Jesus himself baptized not, but his Disciples.*

1. *Ans.* Tho *Jesus himself baptized not*, yet it is said in the *Verse* foregoing, that *He made* and *baptized*, i. e. those whom *His Disciples*, by His Order, *Baptized.* For, if it had not been done *by His Order*, it cou'd not be said that he had *Baptized* those whom his Disciples *Baptized.* But because, *He that doeth a thing by Another*, is said to *do it Himself*, therefore *Christ* himself is said to have *Baptized* those, whom his Disciples, by his Order, did *Baptize.*

2. *Answ.* That *Baptizing* which *Christ* is said to have Administred *himself*, *John* iii. 26. might have been at another *Time* than that which is mentioned in the 4th *Chapter*: And then the consequence will only be this, That, at *some Times*, *Christ* did Baptise *Himself*; and at *other Times*, he left it to his *Disciples.* Tho, as to our Argument, it is the same thing, whether he did it *Himself*, or commanded his *Disciples* to do it. For, either way, it is *his Baptism, his Onely*; his *Disciples* did but *Administer* what he commanded.

II. As *Christ* himself did *Baptize* with *Water*, and his *Disciples*, by his Commandment, while he was with them upon Earth; so did his *Apostles*, and Others, thereunto by them commissionated, after his *Death*, and *Resurrection*, by vertue of his Command to them, *Matth.* xxviii. 19. after he was Risen from the Dead.

What is said above of the *Etymology* and true *Signification* of the word *Baptize*, is, of itself, sufficient to prove, that by *Baptism* in this *Text*, the *outward Baptism* with *Water* is meant: especially till the *Quakers* can shew any *Contradiction* or *Absurdity* in having the word taken in the *proper* and *literal* sense, in this, and the other *Texts* which speak of it. And

And this will be very hard to do, ſince, as it is juſt now proved, that *Chriſt* did *Baptize* with *Water*, as well as *John*. And what *Abſurdity*, or *Contradiction* can be alledged, that his *Apoſtles* ſhou'd Adminiſter the ſame ſort of *Baptiſm*, after his *Death*, as he had *Practiſed* and Commanded during his *Life*? Nay rather, what Reaſon can be given, why they ſhou'd not be the ſame, ſince the ſame *word*, i. e. *Baptize*, is us'd in Both, and no new *Senſe* or *Acceptation* of the *word* is ſo much as hinted? And therefore to put any new *ſenſe* or *acceptation* of the *word*, muſt be wholly *Arbitrary* and *Precarious*.

But, as I promis'd, I will Demonſtrate yet more fully and plainly, that the *Apoſtles* did *Practiſe* the *Outward*, i. e. *Water-Baptiſm* after CHRIST's *death*.

Acts x. 27. *Can any Man forbid* Water, *that theſe ſhou'd not be Baptized?*

Acts viii. 36. *As they* (Philip *and the* Eunuch) *went on their way, they came to a certain* Water, *and the Eunuch ſaid, See here is* Water, *what doth hinder me to be Baptized? — And* (Verſe 38.) *they went both down into the* Water, *both Philip and the Eunuch, and he Baptized him: And when they were come up out of the* WATER, *&c.*

Acts xxii. 16. *And now why tarrieſt thou? Ariſe and be Baptized, and waſh away thy ſins.*

And, to ſave more Quotations, the *Quakers* do own that the *Baptiſm* of the *Corinthians*, mentioned 1 *Cor.* i. 14 & 17. was *Water-baptiſm*.

Therefore I will conclude this Point, as undeniable, That the *Apoſtles* did practiſe *Water-baptiſm*.

And the Argument from thence will lie thus: The *Apoſtles* did practiſe that *Baptiſm* which *Chriſt* commanded *Mat.* xxviii. 19. But the *Apoſtles* did practiſe *Water-baptiſm*; therefore *Water-baptiſm* was that *Baptiſm* which *Chriſt* commanded *Matth.* xxviii. 19.

III. And, as the *Practiſe* of the *Apoſtles* is a moſt ſure Rule whereby to underſtand the meaning of that *Command* which they put in *execution*; ſo the *Practiſe* of thoſe who immediately ſucceeded the *Apoſtles*, who were Cotemporaries with them, and learn'd the Faith from their Mouths, is as certain a Rule to know what the *Practiſe*, and what the *Senſe* of the *Apoſtles* were.

were. And thus the *Practise* of the *present Age*, in the Administration of *Water-baptism*, is an undeniable Evidence, that this was the *Practise* of the *last Age*; the same Persons being, many of them, alive in both the *last* and the *present Age*. For one *Age* does not go off the World all at once, and another succeed all of *perfect Age* together; but there are *old Men* of the *last Age*, and *young Men* and *Children* growing up to another *Age* all alive upon Earth the same time; and *Mankind* being dispersed into far distant *Countries* and *Climates*, who know not of one another, nor hold any Correspondence: It is, by these means, morally impossible for any *Man* or *Men*, to deceive us in what has been the *Universal* and Receiv'd *Practise* of the *last Age*, to which the *present Age* is so linked, that it is even a part of it: I say it is impossible for *all* the *Fathers* of the World, to be suppos'd *willing*, or if they were, to be *capable* of imposing upon all *younger* than themselves, namely, That they had been all *Baptized*, and that this was an universally receiv'd *Custom*; and of which *Registers* were always kept, in every *Parish*, of *all* who had been, from time to time, *Baptized*; and that such *Registers* were *publick*, and to be recurr'd to by all that had a mind to it: Every Man's reason will tell him that it is utterly impossible for such a thing to pass upon Mankind.

And as certainly as the *present Age* is thus assur'd of the *Practise* of the *last Age*, in a Thing of so *publick* and *universal* a nature; so certainly, and by the same Rules, must the *last Age* know the *Practise* of the *Age* before that; and so backward all the way to the *first Institution*, to the *Age* of *Christ*, and the *Apostles*.

The *publick* nature of this *Water-baptism*, as now practised, being an *outward* matter of *Fact*, of which Mens *outward Senses*, their *Eyes* and *Ears* are *Judges*; not like Matters of *Opinion*, which sort of *Tares* may be *privately* sown, and *long time* propagated, without any remarkable Discovery; And to this so *publick* matter of *Fact*, adding the *universal* Practice of it, through all the far distant Nations of *Christianity*: I say these two *Marks* make it impossible for the World to be impos'd upon, nor was it ever, or ever can be impos'd upon, in any such *publick* Matter of *Fact*, so *universally* practised. All this makes it undeniably plain, That the *last Age* did *practise* the same *outward Water-baptism*

ptiſm which is practis'd in *this Age*; and that the ſame was, as certainly, practis'd in the *Age* before the *laſt Age*, and by the ſame Rule, in the *Age* before that; and ſo onward, as aboveſaid, to the *Age* of the *Apoſtles*. I have made more Words of this than needed, but I wou'd render it exceeding plain, conſidering with whom I have to do. And I beſeech them to conſider, That all the Authority which they have to Over-ballance all theſe Demonſtrations, is the mad *Enthuſiaſm* of a *Lay-Apoſtle*, *George Fox*, a *Mechanick* ſo *Illiterate*, that he was hardly Maſter of *common Senſe*, nor cou'd write *Engliſh*, or any other Language; and ſtarted up amongſt us in the Year 1650, (the Age of *Schiſm* and *Rebellion*) and Damn'd, as *Apoſtates*, all *Ages* ſince the *Apoſtles*.

In all of which no One cou'd be found (before *G. Fox*) to bear their Teſtimony againſt this *Water-baptiſm*, tho' it was *conſtantly* and *univerſally* practiſed; and that *Chriſtians* were then ſo *Zealous* as to contend againſt the leaſt Variation or Corruption of the *Faith*, even unto *Death*, and the moſt cruel ſort of *Martyrdom*.

Can any Man imagin, that if *Water-baptiſm* were a *Human Invention*, or *Superſtitiouſly* either *Contin'd* or *Obtruded* upon the *Church*, no One ſhou'd be found, for 1650 Years, to open his Mouth againſt it; when *Thouſands* ſacrific'd their *Lives*, for Matters of much leſs Importance?

But I have over-labour'd this Point, to any Man who will give himſelf leave to make uſe of his Reaſon. Therefore I will proceed to the next *Section*.

SECT. III.

That Baptiſm *muſt be* Outward *and* Viſible, *becauſe it is an Ordinance appointed whereby to* Initiate *Men into an* Outward *and* Viſible Society, *which is the* Church.

THere goes no more towards the proving of this, than to ſhew, 1ſt, That the *Church* is an *Outward* and *Viſible Society*. 2dly, That *Baptiſm* was appointed and us'd for *Initiating* or *Admitting* Men into the *Church*. 1ſt,

1ſt, That the *Church* is an *outward* and *viſible* Society. Our *Saviour* calls it, *A City that is ſet on a Hill*, (Matth. v. 14.) The *Quakers* themſelves are an *outward* and *viſible Society*; and ſo are all thoſe who bear the Name of *Churches* upon Earth. They cou'd not otherwiſe be *Churches*. For that implies a *Society* of *People*; and every *Society* in the World, is an *outward* and *viſible* Thing.

And, as it is ſo, has an *outward* and *viſible Form* of Admitting Men into it: For otherwiſe it wou'd not be known who are *Members* of it. Every *Society* is *Excluſive* of all others who are not of that *Society*; otherwiſe it cou'd not be a *Society*: for that ſuppoſes the Men of that *Society*, to be thereby diſtinguiſhed from other Men: And that ſuppoſes as much that there muſt be ſome *outward* and *viſible* Form whereby to *Initiate* Men, and intitle them to be *Members* of ſuch a *Society*: otherwiſe it cou'd not be known who were *Members* of it, and who were not; and it wou'd thereby *ipſo facto* ceaſe to be a *Society*; for it cou'd not then be diſtinguiſhed from the reſt of Mankind: as a *River* is loſt in the *Sea*, becauſe it is no longer diſtinguiſh'd from it, but goes to make up a part of it.

From hence it appears, that the *Church*, being an *outward* and *viſible Society*, muſt have ſome *outward* and *viſible Form* to *initiate* Men, and make them *Members* of that *Society*.

2dly, That *Baptiſm* was that *outward Form*. All the ſeveral *Baptiſms* that were before *Chriſt's*, were all meant for *Initiating Forms*. The *Jews* had a Cuſtom long before *Chriſt*, to *initiate* the *Proſelites* or *Converts* to their Religion, not only by *Circumciſion*, but by *Baptizing*, or *Waſhing* them with *Water*. The ſame was the meaning of *John's Baptiſm*, to make Men his *Diſciples*. And the ſame was the meaning of *Chriſt's Baptiſm*, to *initiate* Men into the *Chriſtian Religion*, and make them *Diſciples* of *Chriſt*.

Hence *Baptizing* Men, and making them *Diſciples*, mean the ſame thing. Thus *John* iv. 1. it is ſaid, That *Jeſus made and baptized more Diſciples than John*. That is, be *baptized* them *Diſciples*, which was the *Form* of *Making* them ſuch. If any will ſay, that he *baptized* them to be *Diſciples* to *John*, that will be anſwer'd *Sect.* VI. But as to the preſent Point, it is the ſame thing

thing whoſe *Diſciples* they were made; for we are now only to ſhew that *Baptiſm*, in the general, was an *Initiating Form*.

And when *Chriſt* practiſed it, as well as *John*, as this Text does expreſly declare, no Reaſon can be given that he did not uſe it as an *Initiating Form*, as well as *John*; eſpecially when the Text does expreſs that he did *make* them *Diſciples*, by *baptizing* of them, as above is ſhewn.

And purſuant to this, when *Chriſt* ſent his *Apoſtles* to convert *all Nations*, his Commiſſion of *Baptizing* was as large as that of *Teaching*, Matth. xxviii. 19. *Go* TEACH *all Nations*, BAPTIZING *them*, &c. *i. e. Baptizing* all who ſhall receive your word. And accordingly it is ſaid, *Acts* ii. 41. *They that received the word were baptized.* Purſuant to what the *Apoſtle* had preached to them *Verſe* 28. *Repent and be baptized.*

And accordingly we find it the conſtant Cuſtom to *baptize* all that were converted to the *Faith*. Thus *Paul*, tho *miraculouſly* converted from *Heaven*, was commanded to be *baptized*, Acts xxii. 16. And he *baptized Lydia*, and the *Jaylor*, and their Houſeholds, as ſoon as he had converted them, *Acts* xvi. 15, 33. And the *Corinthians*, Acts xviii. 8. And the *Diſciples* of *John*, who had not yet been made *Chriſtians*, Acts xix. 5. *Philip* did *baptize* the *Eunuch*, as ſoon as he believed in *Chriſt*, Acts viii. 37, 38. And *Peter*, immediately upon the Converſion of *Cornelius*, and thoſe with him, ſaid, *Can any Man forbid Water, that theſe ſhou'd not be baptized?* Acts x. 47.

It wou'd be endleſs to enumerate all the like Inſtances of *Baptiſm*, in the *New Teſtament*. And it was always us'd as an *Initiating Form*.

3dly, *Baptiſm* was not only an *Initiating Form*: But it ſerv'd for nothing elſe. For it was never to be *repeated*. As a Man can be *born* but *once* into this World, ſo he can be but *once regenerated*, or *born* into the *Church*; which is therefore, in *Scripture*, called the *New Birth*.

It is ſaid of the other Sacrament (of the *Lord's Supper*) *as often as ye eat this Bread*, &c. I Cor. xi. 26. This was to be *often* repeated.

Baptiſm is our *Admiſſion*, *Initiation*, or *Birth* into the *Society* of the *Church*; and accordingly *once only* to be adminiſtred. The

Lord's Supper is our *Nouriſhment* and *Daily Food* in it; and therefore to be *often* repeated.

And as of our *Saviour's*, ſo of other *Baptiſms*, of *John's*, and the *Jews*, they being only *Initiating Forms*, they were not *repeated*. The *Jews* did not *baptize* their *Proſelites* more than *once*. And *John* did not *baptize* his *Diſciples* more than *once*. So neither were Men *twice baptized* into the *Chriſtian Faith*, more than they were *twice Circumciſed*, or *Admitted* into the *Church*, before *Chriſt*.

Thus having proved, 1ſt, That the *Church* is an *outward* and *viſible* Society. 2dly, That *Baptiſm* was the *Initiating Form* of *Admitting* Men into that *Society*. 3dly, That it was only an *Initiating Form*. I think the Conſequence is undeniable, that this *Baptiſm* muſt be an *outward* and *viſible Form*: Becauſe otherwiſe it cou'd be no *Sign* or *Badge* of an Admiſſion into an *outward* and *viſible* Society; for ſuch a *Badge* muſt be as *outward* as the *Society*.

Again, Acts of *inward Faith* are, and ought to be *often repeated*: Therefore this *Baptiſm*, which cou'd not be *repeated*, cou'd not be the *inward*, but the *outward* Baptiſm.

And thus having prov'd *that Baptiſm* commanded *Matth.* xxviii. 19. to be the *outward*, that is, *Water-baptiſm*: 1ſt, From the *true* and *proper Etymology* and *Signification* of the *Word*. 2dly, From the *Practiſe* of CHRIST, and his *Apoſtles*, and the whole *Chriſtian Church* after them. And, 3dly, From the Nature of the *Thing*, *Baptiſm* being an Ordinance appointed only for *Initiating* Men into an *outward* and *viſible Society*; and therefore never to be *repeated*: Having thus prov'd our Concluſion from ſuch plain, eaſie, and certain Topicks; I will now proceed to thoſe Objections (ſuch as they are) which the *Quakers* do ſet up againſt all theſe clear Demonſtrations. And ſhall accordingly, in the firſt place, take notice of their *groundleſs Pretence* in making *that* BAPTISM commanded in the *Holy Goſpel*, and proved an ORDINANCE *external* and *viſible*, to be underſtood only of the *Inward* and *Spiritual* BAPTISM, not with WATER, but the HOLY GHOST.

SECT.

SECT. IV.

Quakers *ſay*, 1ſt, *That the* BAPTISM *commanded* Matth. xxviii. 19. *was only meant of the* Inward *and* Spiritual *Baptiſm*, with the Holy Ghoſt.

THey *ſay* this; and that is all. They neither pretend to *anſwer* the *Arguments* brought againſt them, ſuch as theſe before-mentioned; nor give any *Proof* for their own *Aſſertion*. Only they *ſay ſo*; and they *will* believe it; and there is an End of it.

And truly there ſhou'd be an End of it, if only *Diſputation*, or *Victory* were my Deſign: For to what *non plus* can any Adverſary be reduc'd beyond that of neither *Anſwering*, nor *Proving*?

But becauſe the Pains I have taken is only in Charity for their Souls, I will over-look all their Impertinency, and deal with them as with weyward Children, humour them, and follow them thro' all their *Windings* and *Turnings*; and ſubmit to *over-prove*, what is abundantly *proved* already. Therefore, ſince they can give no Reaſon why *that Baptiſm* commanded *Matth.* xxviii. 19. ſhou'd be meant *only* of the *Baptiſm* with the *Holy Ghoſt*; and wou'd be content that we ſhou'd leave them there, as obſtinate Men, and purſue them no further; but let them perſwade thoſe whom they can perſwade: By which Method (unhappily yielded to them) they have gain'd and ſecur'd moſt of their *Proſelites*, by keeping them from *Diſputing* or *Reaſoning*; and by perſwading them to hearken only to their own *Light within*: To Reſcue them out of this Snare, I will be content to undertake the *Negative* (though againſt the Rules of Argument,) and to prove, that the *Baptiſm* commanded *Matth.* xxviii. 19. was not the *Baptiſm* with the *Holy Ghoſt*. For,

1ſt, To *baptize* with the *Holy Ghoſt* is peculiar to *Chriſt* alone. For none can *baptize* with the *Holy Ghoſt*, but who can *ſend* and *beſtow* the *Holy Ghoſt*. Which is *Blaſphemy* to aſcribe to any Creature.

Christ has indeed committed the Administration of the *outward Baptism* with *Water* to his *Apostles*, and to Others by them thereunto *ordained*; and has promised the *inward Baptism* of the *Holy Ghost* to those who shall *duly* receive the *outward Baptism*.

But this cannot give the *Apostles*, or any other *Ministers* of *Christ*, the Title of *baptizing* with the *Holy Ghost*; though the *Holy Ghost* may be given by their *Ministration*. For they are not the *Givers*, that is *Blasphemy*.

And pursuant to this, it is observable, that none is ever said, in the *Scripture*, to *baptize with the Holy Ghost* but *Christ* alone: *The same is he who baptizeth with the Holy Ghost*, John i. 33.

And therefore, if that *Baptism* commanded *Matth.* xxviii. 19. was the *Baptism* with the *Holy Ghost*, it wou'd follow that the *Apostles* cou'd *baptize* with the *Holy Ghost*, which is *Blasphemy* to assert.

2dly, It is written, *John* iv. 2. That *Jesus himself baptized not, but his Disciples*. If this was not meant of *Water-baptism*, but of the *Baptism* with the *Holy Ghost*; then it will follow, That *Christ* did *not baptize* with the *Holy Ghost*, but that his *Disciples* did.

This, in short, may suffice in return to a *meer Pretence*, and proceed we next to consider, if their *main Argument* also prove as unsupported and precarious.

SECT. V.

The great Argument of the Quakers *against* Water-Baptism *is this*: John's Baptism *is* ceased: *But* John's Baptism *was* Water-Baptism: *Therefore* Water-Baptism *is* ceased. *This their Learned* Barclay *makes use of*. But,

1st, IT is so extreamly *Childish*, that if it were not *His*, no *Reader* wou'd Pardon me for Answering to it. Yet since they do insist upon it, let them take this easie Answer: That *John's*

John's Water-baptiſm is *ceaſed*; but not *Chriſt's Water-baptiſm*. All *outward Baptiſms* were *Water-baptiſms*, as the word *Baptiſm* ſignifies, (*See* Sect. I.) The *Jews Baptiſm* was *Water-baptiſm*, as well as *John's*. And by this Argument of *Barclay's*, the *Jews* and *John's* may be prov'd to be the ſame. Thus. The *Jews Baptiſm* was *Water-baptiſm*: but *John's Baptiſm* was *Water-baptiſm*: therefore *John's Baptiſm* was the *Jews Baptiſm*.

And thus, *Chriſt's Baptiſm* was *John's*, and *John's* was the *Jews*, and the *Jews* was *Chriſt's*; and they were *all* one and the ſelf-ſame *Baptiſm*, becauſe they were all *Water-baptiſms*.

So without all Foundation is this great Rock of the *Quakers*, upon which they build their main Battery againſt *Water-baptiſm*.

2*ly*, It will be proper here to let them ſee (if they be not wilfully ignorant) What it is which makes the Difference of *Baptiſms*: not the *outward Matter* in which they are adminiſtred (for that may be the ſame in many *Baptiſms*, as is ſhewn.) But *Baptiſms* do differ, 1. In their *Authors*. 2. In the different *Form*, in which they are adminiſtred. 3. In the different *Ends* for which they were inſtituted.

And in all theſe the *Baptiſm* of *Chriſt* does differ vaſtly from the *Baptiſms* both of *John* and the *Jews*, 1. As to the *Author*: The *Baptiſm* of the *Jews* was an Addition of their own to the Law; and had no higher *Author* that we know of. But *John* was ſent by *God*, to *baptize*, John i. 33. And it was *Chriſt the Lord* who was the *Author* of the *Chriſtian Baptiſm*. 2. As to the *Form*: Perſons were *baptized* unto thoſe whoſe *Diſciples* they were admitted by their *Baptiſm*. Thus the *Proſelites* to the *Jewiſh Religion*, were *baptized* unto *Moſes*. And Men were made *Diſciples* to *John*, by his *Baptiſm*. But the *Chriſtian Baptiſm* alone is adminiſtred *in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt*. This is the *Form* of the *Chriſtian Baptiſm*, and which does diſtinguiſh it from all other *Baptiſms* whatever. 3. The *End* of the *Chriſtian Baptiſm* is as highly *diſtant* and *different* from the *Ends* of other *Baptiſms*, as their *Authors* differ. The *End* of the *Jewiſh Baptiſm* was to give the *Baptized* a Title to the *Priviledges* of the Law of *Moſes*. And the *End* of *John's Baptiſm* was to point to HIM who was to come; and to prepare Men, by *Repentance*, for the Reception of the *Goſpel*.

ſpel. But the *End* of CHRIST's *Baptiſm* was to Inſtate Us into all the Unconceivable *Glories*, and High Eternal *Prerogatives* which belong to the *Members of his Body, of his Fleſh, and of his Bones*, Eph. v. 30. *That we might receive the Adoption of Sons*, Gal. iv. 5. Henceforth no more *Servants*, but *Sons* of *God!* and *Heirs* of *Heaven!* Theſe are *Ends* ſo far tranſcendent above the *Ends* of all former *Baptiſms*, that, in compariſon, other *Baptiſms* are not only *leſs*, but *none at all*; like the Glory of the *Stars*, in preſence of the *Sun*; they not only are a *leſſer* Light, but when he appears, they become altogether *inviſible*.

And as a *Pledge* or *Fore-taſte* of theſe *Future* and *Boundleſs Joys*, The Gift of the *Holy Ghoſt* is given upon *Earth*; and is promis'd as an *Effect* of the *Baptiſm* of *Chriſt*. As *Peter* preached, *Acts* ii. 38. *Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jeſus Chriſt, for the remiſſion of ſins, and ye ſhall receive the gift of the Holy Ghoſt.* And *Gal.* iii. 27. *As many of you as have been baptized into Chriſt, have put on Chriſt.*

This of the Gift of the *Holy Ghoſt* was not added to any *Baptiſm* before *Chriſt's*: and does remarkably diſtinguiſh it from all others.

SECT. VI.

That Chriſt *and the* Apoſtles *did not* Baptize *with* John's *Baptiſm.*

THis is a Pretence of the *Quakers* when they find themſelves diſtreſſed with the clear Proofs of *Chriſt* and the *Apoſtles* having adminiſtred *Water-baptiſm*. They ſay that this was *John's* Baptiſm, becauſe it was *Water-baptiſm*. And, as before obſerv'd *Sect.* IV. they only *ſay* this, but can bring no *Proof*. But they put us, here again, upon the *Negative*, to prove it was not.

As to their Pretence that it was *John's Baptiſm*, becauſe it was *Water-baptiſm*, that is anſwered in the laſt *Section*.

And now to gratifie them in this (though unreaſonable) Demand, I will give theſe following Reaſons why the *Baptiſm* which

which *Christ* and his *Apostles* did practise, was not *John*'s *Baptism*:

1st, If *Christ* did *baptize*, with *John*'s *Baptism*; then he made *Disciples* to *John*, and not to himself. For it is before shewn *Sect.* III. *Num.* ii & iii. That *Baptism* was an *Initiating Form*, and nothing else, whereby Men were admitted to be *Disciples* to him unto whom they were *baptized*. Thus the *Jews* who were *baptized* unto *Moses* said, *We are Moses's Disciples*. John ix. 28. And those whom *John* baptized, were called the *Disciples* of *John*. And there needs no more to shew that *Christ* did not *baptize* with the *Baptism* of *John*, than to shew that the *Disciples* of *Christ* and of *John* were not the same, which is made evident from *John* i. 35, 37. where it is told that *two* of *John*'s *Disciples* left him, and followed *Jesus*. And *Matth.* xi. 2. *John* sent *two* of his *Disciples* to *Jesus*. And the *Disciples* of *Christ* lived under a different *Oeconomy*, and other *Rules* than either the *Disciples* of *John*, or of the *Pharisees*, to shew that they were under another *Master*. And the *Disciples* of *John* were scandaliz'd at it, *Matth.* ix. 14. *Then came to him* (Jesus) *the Disciples of John, saying, Why do we, and the Pharisees fast oft, but thy Disciples fast not?*

Therefore the *Disciples* of *Christ* and of *John* were not the same: and therefore *Christ* did *baptize* Men to be *his own* Disciples, and not to be the *Disciples* of *John*: and therefore the *Baptism* of *Christ* was not the *Baptism* of *John*.

2dly, If *Christ* did *baptize* with *John*'s *Baptism*, the *more* he *baptized*, it was the more to the *Honour* and *Reputation* of the *Baptism* of *John*: But *Christ*'s baptizing was urg'd, by the *Disciples* of *John*, as a lessning of *John*, John iii. 26. Therefore the *Baptism* with which *Christ* did *baptize* cou'd not be the *Baptism* of *John*. Though it be said *John* iv. 2. That *Jesus himself baptized not, but his Disciples*: (For so the *Apostles* and other *Ministers* of *Christ* have *baptized* more into the *Faith* of *Christ*, than *Christ himself* has done:) Yet here is no ground of *Jealousie* or *Rivalship* to *Christ*, because the Administration of *Christ's Baptism*, is all to the *Honour* and *Glory* of *Christ*: And therefore *Christ's* baptizing *more* Disciples than *John*, cou'd be no *Lessning* of *John*, but rather a *Magnifying* of him so much the more, if *Christ* had *baptized* with *John*'s Baptism.

3dly,

3dly, When *John*'s *Disciples* had told him of *Christ*'s out rivalling him, by *baptizing* more than he, *John* answer'd, *He must increase, but I must decrease*, John iii. 30. But if CHRIST did *baptize* with the *Baptism* of *John*, than *John* still *increased*, and CHRIST *decreased*. For,

4thly, He is *greater* who *institutes* a *Baptism*, than those who only *administer* a *Baptism* of another's appointment: Therefore if *Christ* did *baptize* with the *Baptism* of *John*, it argues *John* to be *greater* than *Christ*, and *Christ* to be but a *Minister* of *John*.

5thly, All the *Jews* who had been *baptized* with the *Baptism* of *John*, did not turn *Christians*; therefore *John*'s *Baptism* was not the *Christian Baptism*.

6thly, Those of *John*'s Disciples, who turned *Christians*, were *baptized* over again, in the Name of *Christ*; of which there is a remarkable Instance, *Acts* xix. to *v.* 7. But the *same Baptism* was never *repeated* (as is shewn above, *Sect.* III. *Numb.* iii.) therefore the *Baptism* which the *Apostles* did *administer*, was not *John*'s *Baptism*.

7thly, The *Form* of the *Baptism* which *Christ* commanded *Mat.* xxviii. 19. was, *In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*: But that was not the *Form* of *John*'s *Baptism*: Therefore that was not *John*'s *Baptism*. See what is before said *Sect.* V. *Num.* ii. of the Difference of *Baptisms*, as to the *Author*, the *Form*, and the *End* of *each Baptism*: And, in all these Respects, it is made apparent that the *Baptism* which was practis'd by *Christ* and the *Apostles*, was not the *Baptism* of *John*.

To all these clear Arguments the *Quakers*, without answering to any of them, do still insist, That the *Water-baptism* which the *Apostles* did administer, was no other than *John*'s Baptism. That they had no Command for it; only did it in Compliance with the *Jews*, as *Paul* circumcis'd *Timothy*, (*Acts* xvi. 3.) And purify'd himself in the *Temple*, (*Acts* xxi. 21, *to* 27.) But this is all *Gratis Dictum*; here is not one word of *Proof*: And they might as well say, That the *Apostles* PREACHING was only in Compliance with the *Jews*, and that it was the same with *John*'s PREACHING; for their Commissions to *Teach*, and to *Baptize* were both given in the same Breath, *Matth.* xxviii. 19. *Go ye—*TEACH *all Nations*, BAPTIZING *them*, &c.

Now why the *Teaching* here shou'd be *Christ*'s, and *Baptizing* only

only *John*'s, the *Quakers* are desir'd to give some other Reason besides their own *Arbitrary* Interpretations; before which no Text in the *Bible*, or any other Writing can stand.

Besides, I wou'd inform them, That the *Greek* word μαθητεύσατε, in this Text, which we Translate *Teach*, signifies to *make Disciples*; so that the *literal*, and more *proper* reading of that Text is, *Go*, and Disciple *all Nations*, or *make Disciples* of them, *baptizing them*, &c.

If it be ask'd, Why we shou'd Translate the Word μαθητεύσατε, *Matt.* xxviii. 19. by the Word *Teach*, if it means to *Disciple* a Man, or make him a *Disciple*?

I Answer: That *Teaching* was the Method whereby to *Perswade* a Man, to *Convert* him, so as to make a *Disciple* of him. But the *Form* of *Admitting* him into the *Church*, and actually to make him a *Disciple*, to give him the *Priviledges* and *Benefits* of a *Disciple*, was by *Baptism*.

Now the *Apostles* being sent to *Teach* Men, in order to make them *Disciples*; therefore instead of Go, *Disciple* Men, we Translate it, Go, *Teach*, as being a more Familiar Word, and better understood in *English*.

Tho' if both the *Greek* words μαθητεύσατε, and βαπτίζοντες, in this Text, were Translated Literally, it would obviate these *Quaker*-Objections more plainly: For then the Words wou'd run thus; *Go and Admit all Nations to be my Disciples, by Washing them with Water, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* διδάσκοντες, *Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.*

Here the Word διδάσκοντες, i. e. *Teaching*, is plainly distinguished from μαθητεύσατε, to *Disciple* them; tho' our *English* renders them both by the Word *Teaching*, and makes a Tautology: *Go* Teach *all Nations* —— Teaching *them*.

But, as a *Child* is *Admitted* into a *School* before it be *Taught*: So *Children* may be *Admitted* into the *Pale* of the *Church*, and be made *Disciples*, by *Baptism*, before they are *Taught*. Which shews the meaning of these two Words, *i. e. Discipling*, and *Teaching*, to be different. Because, tho' in Persons Adult, *Teaching* must go before *Discipling*; yet in *Children* (who are within the *Covenant*, as of the *Law*, to be Admitted at *eight Days* old, by *Circumcision*; so under the *Gospel*, by *Baptism*) *Discipling*

goes before *Teaching*: And that *Diſcipling* is only by *Baptiſm*.

But to return. The *Quakers* are ſo hard put to it, when they are preſs'd with that Text, *Acts* x. 47. *Can any forbid Water*, &c? That they are forced to make a *Suppoſe*, (without any ground or appearance of Truth) That theſe Words were an Anſwer to a Queſtion. And that the Queſtion was, Whether they might not be Baptized with *John*'s Baptiſm? And that this proceeded from a Fondneſs the *Jews* had to *John*'s Baptiſm. And that the Apoſtle *Peter* only Comply'd with them out of Condeſcention, as *Paul* Circumcis'd *Timothy*.

Anſ. 1. *Cornelius*, and thoſe whom *Peter* Baptized, *Acts* x. were *Gentiles* and not *Jews*: They were *Romans*, and therefore cannot be ſuppoſed to have had any Longing after *John*'s Baptiſm; none of them having ever own'd it, or having been Baptiz'd with it.

2. The *Gentile Converts* to *Chriſtianity*, refus'd to ſubmit to the *Jewiſh Circumciſion*, or any of their *Law* (*Acts* xv.) And therefore it is not to be imagin'd, that they wou'd be fond of any of the *Baptiſms* which were us'd among the *Jews*.

3. Even all the *Jews* themſelves, no not the *Chief* and *Principal* of them, neither the *Phariſees* nor *Lawyers* did ſubmit to *John*'s Baptiſm, *Luke* vii. 30.

4. The *Ethiopian Eunuch* requeſted *Baptiſm* from *Philip*, (*Acts* viii.) And it cannot be ſuppos'd, that the *Ethiopians* had more knowledge of *John*'s *Baptiſm*, or regard for it, than the *Romans*, or great part of the *Jews* themſelves.

5. There is no ground to ſuppoſe that St. *Peter*'s words, *Can any Man forbid Water*, &c? were an Anſwer to any Queſtion that was asked him. The moſt forcible *Affirmation* being often expreſs'd by way of *Queſtion*.

Can any Man forbid Water? That is, *No Man can forbid it*. And for the ſaying, *Then Anſwered* Peter. There is nothing more familiar in the *New Teſtament*, than that Expreſſion when no *Queſtion* at all was asked. See *Matt.* xi. 25. xii. 38. xvii. 4. xxii. 1. *Mark* xi. 14. xii. 35. xiv. 48. *Luke* vii. 40. xiv. 3, 4, 5. xxii. 51. *John* v. 17, 19.

6. Grant-

6. Granting a Queſtion was ask'd, and that *Cornelius*, as well as the *Ethiopian*, had deſir'd *Baptiſm*, why muſt this be conſtru'd of *John*'s Baptiſm? Eſpecially conſidering, that *Peter*, in that ſame Sermon which Converted *Cornelius* (Act. x. 37.) told them that the *Goſpel* which he Preached unto them, was that which was *publiſhed, after the Baptiſm which* John *Preached.* What Argument was this for *Cornelius* to return back again to *John*'s *Baptiſm?* Or, if he had deſir'd it, why ſhou'd we think that *Peter* wou'd have *Comply'd* with him; and not rather have *reprov'd* him, and carry'd him beyond it, to the *Baptiſm* of *Chriſt:* as *Paul* did (*Acts* xix.) to thoſe who had before receiv'd the *Baptiſm* of *John?*

7. But as to the *Complyance* which the *Quakers* wou'd have to *John*'s *Baptiſm*; and which they compare to *Paul*'s Complyance in *Circumciſing* Timothy: I will ſhew the great Diſparity.

Firſt, The *Law* was more univerſally receiv'd than *John*'s *Baptiſm:* For *many* and the *Chief* of the *Jews* did not receive *John*'s *Baptiſm*, as above-obſerv'd.

Secondly, The Law was of much longer ſtanding: *John*'s *Baptiſm* was like a *Flaſh* of *Lightning*, like the *Day-Star*, which uſher'd in the *Sun* of *Righteouſneſs*, and then diſappear'd: But the *Law* continu'd during the long *Night* of *Types* and *Shadows*, many *hundreds* of *Years.*

Thirdly, *John* did no *Miracle* (*John* x. 41.) But the *Law* was delivered, and propagated by many *Ages* of *Miracles.* 'Twas enjoyn'd under Penalty of *Death*, to them and their *Poſterities*; whereas *John*'s *Baptiſm* laſted not one Age, was intended only for the Men then preſent, to point out to them the *Meſſiah*, then already come, and ready to appear: And no outward *Penalties* were annexed to *John*'s *Law*; People were only *Invited*, not *Compell'd* to come unto his *Baptiſm:* But to neglect *Circumciſion*, was *Death*, Gen. xvii. 14. Exod. iv. 24.

The *Preaching* of *John* was only a *Warning*; let thoſe take notice to it that wou'd:

Whereas the *Law* was pronounced by the Mouth of *God* Himſelf, in *Thunder* and *Lightning*, and out of the midſt of the *Fire*, upon Mount *Sinai*, in the Audience of all the People: *And ſo terrible was the Sight, that* Moſes *ſaid, I exceedingly fear*

and quake, Heb. xii. 21. For *from God's Right Hand went a Fire of Law for them*, Deut. xxxiii. 2.

From all these Reasons, we must suppose the *Jews* to be much more Tenacious of the *Law*, than of *John*'s *Baptism*; and to be brought off with greater difficulty from their *Circumcision*, which had descended down to them all the way from *Abraham*, 430 Years before the *Law*, (Gal. iii. 17.) than from *John*'s *Baptism*, which was but of Yesterday; and never receiv'd by the Chief of the *Jews*. And therefore there was much more reason for *Paul*'s Complying with the *Jews* in the Case of *Circumcision*, than in that of *John*'s *Baptism*, as the *Quakers* suppose.

When *Christ* came to fulfil the *Law*, he did it with all regard to the *Law*, (Matth. v. 17, 18, 19.) He *destroy'd* it not with *Violence*, all at once; but *fulfill'd* it *leasurely* and by *degrees*: *Ut cum honore Mater Synagoga sepeliretur*. The *Synagogue* was the *Mother* of the *Church*; and therefore it was fitting that she shou'd be *Bury'd* with all *Decency* and *Honour*.

This was the Reason of all those *Complyances* with the *Jews*, at the *beginning*, to wear them off, by degrees, from their *Superstition* to the *Law*.

Tho' in this some might Comply too far: And there want not those who think that *Paul*'s Circumcising of *Timothy*, (Acts xvi. 3.) was as *faulty* a *Complyance*, as that which he blam'd in *Peter*, (Gal. ii.) For that of *Paul*'s is not Commended, in the Place where it is mentioned.

And now I appeal to the Reason of Mankind, whether Objections thus pick'd up from such *obscure* and *uncertain* Passages, ought to overballance *plain* and *positive Commands*, which are both back'd and explain'd by the *Practise* of the *Apostles*, and the *Universal Church* after them? All which I have before Demonstrated of *Baptism*.

8. But however the *Quakers* may argue from *Paul*'s Complyance with the *Jews*, the *Reader* has reason to complain of my *Complyance* with *Them*: For, after all that has been said, there is not one single Word in any Text of the *N. T.* that does so much as hint at any such thing, as that *Peter*'s Baptizing of *Cornelius*, or *Philip*'s Baptizing of the *Eunuch*, was in any sort of *Complyance* unto *John*'s *Baptism*. This is a perfect Figment, out of the *Quaker*'s own Brain, without any Ground or Foundation

in

in the World: And therefore there was no need of Answering it at all, otherwise than to bid the *Quakers* prove their *Assertion*, That these *Baptisms* were in Complyance with *John*'s, which they cou'd never have done.

Whereas it is plain from the Words of the Text, (*Acts* xvi. 3.) that *Paul*'s Circumcising *Timothy*, was in Complyance with the *Jews*: It is expresly so said, and the Reason of it given, because, tho' his *Mother* was a *Jewess*, yet his *Father* was a *Greek*; and therefore, *because of the* Jews *which were in those Quarters* (says the Text) he Circumcised *Timothy*, that these *Jews* might *Hear* and *Receive* him, which, otherwise, they wou'd not have done. Now let the *Quakers* shew the like Authority, that the *Baptisms* of *Cornelius*, of the *Eunuch*, and of the *Corinthians*, Acts xviii. 8. (For that too they acknowledge to have been *Water-Baptism*, as I will shew presently) let the *Quakers* shew the like Authority, as I have given for the *Circumcision* of *Timothy* being in *Complyance* with the *Jews*, let them shew the like, I say, that the foresaid *Baptisms* were in *Complyance* with *John*'s, and then they will have something to say. But till then, this *Excuse*, or *Put off* of theirs, is nothing else but a *hopeless Shift* of a *desperate Cause*, to suppose, against all sense, that these *Gentiles*, (*Romans*, *Ethiopians*, and *Corinthians*) desir'd *John*'s *Baptism*, who rejected all the *Laws* and *Customs* of the *Jews*.

SECT. VII.

The Quakers *Master-Objection from* 1 Cor. i. 14. *I thank GOD that I Baptized none of you, but* Crispus *and* Gaius. *And* Ver. 17. *For Christ sent me not to Baptize, but to Preach the Gospel.*

FROM this Passage they argue, That *Water-Baptism* was not commanded by *Christ*, because here St. *Paul* says, That he was not sent to *Baptize*; and that he thanks God, that he *Baptiz'd* so few of them. But,

In

In Answer to this, I will first of all premise, That a bare *Objection*, without some *Proof* on the other side, does neither justifie *their* Cause, nor overthrow *ours*: For when a thing is Proved *Affirmatively*, it cannot be overthrown by *Negative* Difficulties which may be Objected.

You must dissolve the *Proofs* which are brought to support it: Nothing else will do.

For what *Truth* is there so evident in the World, against which no Objection can be rais'd?

Even the Being of a *God* has been disputed against by these sort of Arguments; that is, by raising *Objections*, and starting *Difficulties*, which may not easily be Answer'd: But while those Demonstrative Arguments, which *Prove* a *God*, remain unshaken, a thousand *Difficulties* are no *Disproof*.

And so, while the *Command* of *Christ*, and the *Practise* of his *Apostles*, and of all the *Christian World*, in pursuance of that Command, are clearly *Prov'd*, no *Difficulty* from an obscure Text, can shake such a Foundation.

But I lay down this, only as a General Rule; because this Method is so much made use of by the *Quakers* (and others) who never think of Answering plain *Proofs*; but by raising a great *Dust* of *Objections*, wou'd *bury* and *hide* what they cannot *Disprove*.

I say, that I only mind them at present, of this fallacious Artifice; for I have no use for it as to these *Texts* objected, to which a very plain and easie Answer can be given. And,

First, I would observe, how the *Quakers* can understand the Word *Baptize* to mean *Water-Baptism*, or *no Water-Baptism*, just as the *Texts* seem to favour their cause, or otherwise.

For there is no mention of *Water* in either of the *Texts* objected, only the single word *Baptize*. And why then must they construe these *two* Texts only, of all the rest in the *New Testament*, to mean *Water-Baptism*? Why? but only to strain an Objection out of them against *Water-Baptism*?

But will they let the Word *Baptize* signifie *Water-Baptism*, in other places, as well as in these?

They

They cannot refuſe it with any ſhew or colour of Reaſon. They muſt not refuſe it in *Acts* xviii. 8. where the *Baptizing* of *Criſpus* (mention'd in the firſt of the *Texts* objected) is recorded. And there, it is not only ſaid of *Criſpus*, that he was *baptized*, but that *many of the* Corinthians *hearing, believed, and were baptized.* By which, the *Quakers* cannot deny *Water-Baptiſm* to be meant, ſince they conſtrue it ſo, 1 *Cor.* i. 14.

Secondly, We may further obſerve, that in the Text, *Acts* xviii. 8. *Criſpus* is only ſaid to have *believed*, which was thought ſufficient to infer, that he was *baptized*; which cou'd not be, unleſs all that *believed*, were *baptized*: Which, no doubt, was the Caſe, as it is written, *Acts* xiii. 48. *As many as were ordained to eternal Life, believed.* And (Ch. ii. 41.) *They that received the Word, were baptized*, And (V. 47.) *The Lord added to the Church daily ſuch as ſhou'd be ſaved.*

So that this is the *Climax* or *Scale* of *Religion*. As many as are ordained to eternal Life do *believe*: And they that *believe*, are *baptized*: And they that are *baptized*, are added to the *Church*.

And to ſhew this received Notion, That whoever did *believe* was *baptized*, when *Paul* met ſome *Diſciples* who had not heard of the *Holy Ghoſt*, *Acts* xix. 3. he did not ask them whether they had been *baptized*, or not? He took that for granted, ſince they *believed*. But he asks, *Unto what were ye baptized?* Suppoſing that they had been *baptized*.

Thirdly, Here then this *Objection* of the *Quakers*, has turn'd into an invincible *Argument* againſt them.

They have, by this, yielded the whole Cauſe: For if the *Baptiſm*, 1 Cor. i. 14. be *Water-Baptiſm*, then that *Baptiſm*, *Acts* xviii. 8. muſt be the ſame: And conſequently all the other *Baptiſms*, mention'd in the *Acts*, are, as theſe, *Water-Baptiſms* alſo.

But, beſides the *Quakers* Confeſſion (for they are unconſtant, and may change their Minds) the thing ſhews it ſelf, that the *Baptiſm* mention'd, 1 *Cor.* i. 14. was *Water-Baptiſm*; becauſe *Paul* there *thanks God, that he baptized none of them but* Criſpus *and* Gaius. Wou'd the *Apoſtle* thank God that he had baptized

ſo

ſo *few*, with the *Holy Ghoſt*? Or wou'd he repent of baptizing with the *Holy Ghoſt*? Therefore it muſt be the *Water-Baptiſm* which was here ſpoke of.

Fourthly, But now, what is the Reaſon, that he was glad he had *baptized* ſo *few* with *Water-Baptiſm*? And he gives the Reaſon, in the very next words. (V. 15.) *Leſt any ſhou'd ſay, that I had baptized in mine own Name.* What was the occaſion of this Fear? It is told from *V.* 10. That there were great *Diviſions* and *Contentions* among theſe *Corinthians*, and that theſe were grounded upon the Æmulation that aroſe among them, in behalf of their ſeveral *Teachers*. One was for *Paul*, another for *Apollos*, others for *Cephas*, and others for *Chriſt*.

This wou'd ſeem, as if the Chriſtian Religion had been contradictory to it ſelf:

As if *Chriſt*, and *Cephas*, and *Paul*, and *Apollos* had ſet up againſt one another:

As if they had not all taught the ſame Doctrine:

As if each had preach'd up *himſelf*, and not *Chriſt*:

And had *baptized* Diſciples, each in *his own Name*, and not in *Chriſt's*; and had begot Followers to *himſelf*, and not to *Chriſt*.

To remove this ſo horrible a Scandal, St. *Paul* argues with great zeal, (V. 13.) *Is Chriſt divided?* (ſays he) *Was* Paul *Crucified for you? Or were ye baptized in the Name of* Paul? *I thank God, that I baptized none of you but* Criſpus *and* Gaius; *leſt any ſhould ſay, That I had baptiz'd in mine own Name.*

There needs no Application of this, the Words of the *Apoſtle* are themſelves ſo plain.

He did not thank God, that they had not been *baptized*; but that *He* had not done it.

And this, not for any ſlight to *Water-Baptiſm*; but to obviate the Objection of his *baptizing* in *his own Name*.

Fifthly, By the way, this is a ſtrong Argument for *Water-Baptiſm*: Becauſe the *Inward Baptiſm* of the *Spirit*, cometh not with *Obſervation* and *Shew*, but is *within* us, *Luk.* xvii. 20, 21. Nor is it done in any Body's *Name*, it is an *inward* Operation upon the *Heart*.

But

But the *outward Baptiſm* is always done in ſome *Name* or other; in his *Name* whoſe *Diſciple* you are *thereby* made and *Admitted*.

Therefore it muſt, of neceſſity, be the *outward Baptiſm*, of which St. *Paul* here ſpeaks; becauſe it was *outwardly* Adminiſtred, in ſuch an *outward Name*. And he makes this an Argument that he had not made *Diſciples* to *himſelf*, but to *Chriſt*; becauſe he did not *Baptize* them in *his own Name*, but in *Chriſt*'s.

Now this had been no *Argument*, but perfect *Banter*, if there had been no *outward Baptiſm*, that the People cou'd have both *ſeen* and *heard*. How otherwiſe cou'd they tell in what *Name*, or *no Name* they were *baptized*, if all was *Inward* and *Inviſible*?

But I need not prove what the *Quakers* grant and contend for, that all this was meant of *Water-Baptiſm*; becauſe otherwiſe their whole Objection, from this place, does fall.

VI. But they wou'd infer as if no great ſtreſs were laid upon it; becauſe that *few* were ſo *baptized*.

I Anſwer. That there is nothing in the *Text* which does infer, that *few* of theſe *Corinthians* were *baptized*.

St. *Paul* only thanks God, that he *himſelf* had not done it, except to a *few*, for the Reaſons before given: But *Acts* xviii. 8. it is ſaid, That beſides *Criſpus*, whom *Paul* himſelf *baptized*, MANY *of the* Corinthians *were baptized*.

Nay, they were all *baptized*, as many as *believed*, as before is prov'd. And, in this very place, St. *Paul* taking it for granted, that all who *believed*, were *baptiz'd*, which I have already obſerv'd from his Queſtion to *certain Diſciples*, Acts xix. 3. not whether they were *baptized*, but *unto what*, i. e. *In what Name*, they had been *baptized*? So here 1 *Cor.* i. 13. He does not make the Queſtion, whether they had been *baptized*? That he takes for granted. But *in what Name, were ye baptized*? Which ſuppoſes, not only that *all* were *baptized*, but likewiſe that all who were *baptized*, were baptized in ſome *outward Name*; and therefore that it was the *Outward*, i. e. *Water-Baptiſm*.

VII. But the ſecond Text objected, *V.* 17. is yet to be accounted for; where St. *Paul* ſays, *Chriſt ſent me not to Baptize, but to Preach the Goſpel.* This he ſaid in juſtification of himſelf for having *baptiz'd* ſo *few* in that place; for which he bleſſes God, becauſe, as it happened, it prov'd a great juſtification of his not baptizing in *his own Name.*

But then, on the other hand, here wou'd ſeem to be a Neglect in him of his Duty: For if it was his Duty to have baptiz'd them *all*, and he baptiz'd but a *few*, here was a great Neglect.

In Anſwer to this, we find, that there was no Neglect in not *baptizing* them, for that, not a *few* but *many* of the *Corinthians* were *baptized*, *Acts* xviii. 8. that is, as many as *believed*, as before is ſhewn.

But then who was it that *baptized* thoſe *many*? For St. *Paul baptized* but a *few.*

I Anſwer. The *Apoſtle* employ'd others, under him, to *Baptize.*

And he vindicates this, by ſaying, That he was *not ſent to Baptize*, i. e. *principally* and *chiefly*; that was not the *chief* part of his Commiſſion: But the *greater* and more *difficult* part was that of *Preaching*, to *Diſpute* with, *Perſwade* and *Convert* the *Heathen* World. To this, *great Parts*, and *Courage*, and *Miraculous Gifts* were neceſſary: But to Adminiſter the *outward Form* of *Baptiſm* to thoſe who were *Converted*, had no Difficulty in it; requir'd no great *Parts*, or *Endowments*, only a *lawful Commiſſion* to Execute it.

And it wou'd have taken up too much of the *Apoſtles* time, it was impoſſible for them to have *baptized*, with their own Hands, thoſe vaſt Multitudes whom they Converted. *Chriſtianity* had reach'd to all Quarters of the then known World, as far almoſt, as at this Day, before the *Apoſtles* left the World. And cou'd Twelve Men *Baptize* the *whole World?* Their *Progreſs* was not the leaſt of their *Miracles:* The *Bread of Life* multiply'd faſter, in their *Diſtribution* of it, than the *Loaves* by our SAVIOUR's *Breaking* of them. St. *Peter* Converted about *three Thouſand* at one Sermon, *Acts* ii. 41. And at another time about *five Thouſand*, Ch. iv. 4. *Multitudes both of Men and Women.* Ch. v. 14. Many more than the *Apoſtles* cou'd have *counted*; much more than

than they cou'd have *baptized*; for which if they had ſtay'd, they had made ſlender Progreſs. No. The *Apoſtles* were ſent, as *loud Heraulds*, to *proclaim* to all the Earth, to run ſwiftly, and gather much People; and not to ſtay (they cou'd not ſtay) for the *baptizing* with their own Hands, all that they Converted: They left that to others, whom they had ordain'd to Adminiſter it. Yet not ſo, as to exclude themſelves; but they themſelves did *Baptize*, where they ſaw occaſion, as St. *Paul* here did BAPTIZE *Criſpus* and *Gaius*, and the Houſe of *Stephanas*, ſome of the Principal of the *Corinthians*. Not that he was oblig'd to have done it himſelf, having others to whom he might have left it: For he was not *ſent*, that is, put under the *Neceſſity* to *Baptize* with his own Hands, but to *Preach*, to Convert others, that was his *principal* Province, and which he was not to neglect, upon the account of *baptizing*, which others could do as well as he.

But if you will ſo underſtand the Words of his not being *ſent*, i. e. that it was not within his *Commiſſion*, that he was not *Impower'd* by *Chriſt*, to *Baptize*, then it wou'd have been a *Sin*, and great *Preſumption* in him, to have *baptized* any body.

Nay more. This Text, thus underſtood, is flatly contradictory to *Matt.* xxviii. 19. which ſays, *Go, Baptize*; And this ſays, *I am not ſent to Baptize.*

Theſe are contradictory, if by, *I am not ſent*, be underſtood, I have not *Power* or *Commiſſion* to *Baptize.*

But by, *I am not ſent*, no more is meant in this *Text*, than that *Baptizing* is not the *chief* or *principal* part of my *Commiſſion.* As if a *General* were accuſed for *Muſtering* and *Liſting* Men *in his own Name*, and not in the *King*'s, and he ſhou'd ſay, in Vindication of himſelf, that he had never *liſted* any, except ſuch and ſuch *Officers*; for that he was not *ſent* to *Muſter*, or *Drill* Men, or to Exerciſe *Troops* or *Regiments*, but to Command the *Army:* Wou'd it follow from hence, that he had not Power to *Exerciſe* a *Troop* or a *Regiment*, or that it was not within his *Commiſſion?* Or if a *Doctor* of *Phyſick* ſhould ſay, That it was not his Part to *compound Medicines*, and make up *Drugs* (that was the *Apothecary*'s Buſineſs) but to give *Preſcriptions*; wou'd any Man infer from this, that he might not *Compound* his own *Medicines* if he pleas'd?

Or if (to come nearer) a *Profeſſor* of *Divinity*, or a *Biſhop*, ſhou'd ſay, That he was not *ſent* to *Teach School*; this wou'd not imply that he might not *Keep School*; nay, he ought, if there were no others to do it: So the *Apoſtle* of the *Gentiles* was not *ſent* to ſpend his Time in *Baptizing*, *Viſiting the Sick*, or other Parts of his Duty, (which others might perform) ſo as to hinder his great Work in Converting of the *Gentiles*: All of whom he cou'd not *Baptize*, nor *Viſit* all their *Sick*: Yet both theſe were within his *Commiſſion*, and he *might* and *did* Execute them where he ſaw occaſion. As if all the *Sick* in *London* ſhou'd expect to be *Viſited* by the Biſhop of *London*; and all the *Children* ſhou'd be brought to be *baptized* by him; he might well ſay, That he was not *ſent* to *Baptize*, or to *Viſit* their *Sick*, but to look after his *Epiſcopal* Function: And ſend them for theſe *Offices*, to others, under him: And yet this wou'd no ways imply, that theſe Offices were not within the *Epiſcopal* Commiſſion; or that he was not *ſent* both to *Baptize*, and to *Viſit the Sick*: But only that he was not ſent *principally* and *chiefly* to *Baptize*, or to *Viſit the Sick*.

And as to that Phraſe of being *ſent*; we find it us'd in this ſame ſenſe, to mean only being *chiefly* and *principally* ſent. Thus, *Gen.* xlv. 8. *Joſeph* ſaid to his Brethren, *It was not you that ſent me hither, but God.* It was certainly his *Brethren* who *ſent* him, for they *ſold* him into *Egypt*: But it was not They, *principally* and *chiefly*, but *God*, who had other and extraordinary Ends in it.

Adam *was not deceived* (ſays the Apoſtle, 1 *Tim.* ii. 14.) *but the Woman being deceived, was in the Tranſgreſſion. Adam* was *deceived*, and *fell* as well as the *Woman*; but the meaning is, he was not *firſt*, or *principally* deceived.

Again. As for you who ſtick ſo cloſe to the *Letter* (when it ſeemeth to ſerve your turn) *Go ye and learn what that meaneth*, I WILL HAVE MERCY, AND NOT SACRIFICE, *Matt.* ix. 13.

By which it cannot be underſtood, that God did not require *Sacrifice*; for he *commanded* it upon Pain of *Death*. Yet he ſays, (Jer. vii. 22.) *I ſpake not unto your Fathers, nor commanded them — concerning Burnt-Offerings, or Sacrifices: But this thing Commanded I them, ſaying, Obey my Voice*, &c. according as it is written, (1 Sam xv. 22.) *To Obey is better than Sacrifice.*

By

By all which cannot be meant, that God did not Command the *Jews* concerning *Burnt-Offerings* and *Sacrifices* (for we know how particularly they were commanded) but that the *outward Sacrifice* was not the *chief* and *principal* part of the Command; which reſpected *chiefly* the *inward* Sacrifice and Circumciſion of the *Heart*.

Which when they neglected, and lean'd wholly to the *Outward*, then God deteſts their *Oblations*; Iſa. i. 14. *Your new Moons, and your appointed Feaſts my Soul hateth, I am weary to bear them.* And he ſays, V. 12. *Who hath required this at your Hand?*

It was certainly *God* who had *required* all theſe things at their hands; but theſe *outward Performances*, (tho' the *Neglect* or *Abuſe* of them was puniſhed with *Death*) yet they were not the *chief* and *principal* part of the Command, being intended *chiefly* for the ſake of the *Inward* and *Spiritual* Part: From which when they were ſeparated, they were (like the *Body*, when the *Soul* is gone) a *dead* and a *loathſome* CARCASS of *Religion*: And which *God* is therefore ſaid, not to have commanded, becauſe he did not Command them without the other: As he made not the *Body* without the *Soul*; yet he made the *Body* as well as the *Soul*.

VIII. And as there is *Soul* and *Body* in *Man*, ſo (while *Man* is in the *Body*) there muſt be a *Soul* and *Body* of *Religion*; that is, an *outward* and an *inward* WORSHIP, with our *Bodies* as well as our *Souls*.

And as the Separation of *Soul* and *Body* in *Man*, is called *Death*; ſo is the Separation of the *outward* and the *inward* Part of *Religion*, the *Death* and *Deſtruction* of *Religion*.

The *outward* is the *Cask*, and the *inward* is the *Wine*. The *Cask* is no Part of the *Wine*; but if you break the *Cask*, you loſe the *Wine*. And as certainly, whoever deſtroy the *outward* Inſtitutions of *Religion*, loſe the *inward* Parts of it too.

As is ſadly experienc'd in the *Quakers*, who, having thrown off the *outward Baptiſm*, and the other *Sacrament* of *Chriſt's Death*, have, thereby, loſt the *inward* thing ſignify'd, which is, the PERSONAL *Chriſt*, as Exiſting *without all other Men*, and having ſo *Suffer'd*, *Roſe*, *Aſcended*, and now, and for ever, *Sitteth*

Sitteth in *Heaven*, in his true proper *Human Nature*, WITHOUT *all other Men*. This the *Quakers* will not own, (except ſome of the *New* Separation) and this they have loſt, by their Neglect of thoſe *outward Sacraments*, which *Chriſt* appointed for this very End (among others) that is, as *Remembrances* of his *Death*: For it had been morally impoſſible for Men, who had *conſtantly* and with *due Reverence*, attended theſe holy *Sacraments* of *Baptiſm* and the *Lord's Supper*, ever to have *forgot* his *Death*, ſo lively repreſented before their Eyes, and into which they were *baptized*; or to have turn'd all into a meer *Allegory*, perform'd *within* every Man's *Breaſt*, as theſe *Quakers* have done.

But the *Enemy* has perſwaded them to break the *Cask*, and deſtroy the *Body* of *Religion*; whereby the *Wine* is ſpilt, and the *Soul* of *Religion* is fled from them: And by neglecting the *outward Part*, they have loſt the whole *inward*, and *Truth* of *Religion*; which is a true *Faith* in the OUTWARD *Chriſt*, and in the *Satisfaction* made for our *Sins*, by his *Blood* OUTWARDLY *ſhed*; and in his *Interceſſion*, in our *Nature*, as our *High-Prieſt*, at his *Father's* Right Hand, *now*, in *Heaven*; into which *Holy of Holies*, He has carry'd his own *Blood* of *Expiation*, *once* offer'd upon the *Croſs*, and *preſents* it, for *ever*, as the *Atonement* and full *ſatisfaction* for the *Sins* of the *whole World*; but apply'd only by true *Faith* and *Repentance*, thereby, becomes fully Effectual to the *Salvation* of every *Faithful Penitent*.

This is the only true *Chriſtian Faith*: And from this the *Quakers* have totally fallen; and that chiefly, by their *Mad* throwing off the OUTWARD *Guards*, *Preſervatives*, *Fences*, *Sacraments*, and *Pledges* of *Religion*. And thoſe OUTWARD *Means of Grace*, which *Chriſt* has commanded, and given us as the only OUTWARD GROUNDS for our *Hope of Glory*. For how can that Man get to *Heaven*, who will not go the way that *Chriſt* has appointed; who came down from *Heaven*, on purpoſe to *ſhew* and *lead* us the way thither; yet we will be *wiſer* than he, find fault with his *Inſtitutions*, as being too much upon the *Outward*; and think that we can and may *Spiritualize* them *finer*, and make the way *ſhorter* than he has done

IX.

IX. But to return, if the *Quakers* cou'd find ſuch *Texts* concerning *Baptiſm*, as I have ſhewn above concerning *Sacrifices*, as if it were ſaid, That *God* did *not command* Baptiſm; that he *hated it*, and was *weary to bear it*, that *he would not have it*, &c. If ſuch *Texts* cou'd be found, How wou'd the *Quakers* triumph! Who wou'd be able to ſtand before them! And yet, if ſuch were found, they wou'd prove no more againſt the *outward* BAPTISM, than they did againſt the *outward* SACRIFICES, *i. e.* That if any regarded nothing-elſe in *Baptiſm*, than the *outward Waſhing*, it wou'd be as hateful to God, as the *Jewiſh Sacrifices*, when they regarded nothing more in them but the *Outward*.

And it may be truly ſaid, That God did not Command either ſuch *Sacrifices*, or ſuch a *Baptiſm*; becauſe he commanded not the *outward* alone, but with reſpect unto, and *chiefly* for the ſake of the *Inward*.

And, therefore, as all theſe, and other the like Expreſſions in the *Old Teſtament* did not at all tend to the *Abolition*, only to the *Rectification* of the Legal *Sacrifices*: So, much leſs, can that ſingle Expreſſion, 1 *Cor.* i. 17. of *Paul*'s ſaying (upon the occaſion, and in the ſenſe above mention'd) that *he was not ſent to Baptize, but to Preach*, much leſs can this infer the *Abolition* of *Baptiſm*; being as poſitively *commanded*, as *Sacrifices* were under the *Law*, and as certainly *practis'd* by the *Apoſtles*, as the *Sacrifices* were by the *Levitical Prieſts*.

X. Now ſuppoſe that I ſhould deny, that OUTWARD *Sacrifices* were ever *commanded*; or, that the *Jews* did ever *practiſe* them: And ſhou'd Interpret all that is ſaid of *Sacrifices*, only of the *Inward*, as the *Quakers* do of *Baptiſm*; and I ſhou'd produce the *Texts* above quoted to prove that God did not command *Sacrifices*, which are much more poſitive than that *ſingle one* which is ſtrain'd againſt *Baptiſm*: I ſay, ſuppoſe that I ſhou'd be ſo Extravagant as to ſet up ſuch a Notion, what Method (except that of *Bedlam*, which, in that Caſe, wou'd be moſt proper) cou'd be taken to convince me? And ſuppoſe I ſhou'd gain as many *Proſelytes* as *G. Fox* has done: And we ſhou'd boaſt

our

our *Numbers*, and *Light within*, &c. wou'd not this following Method be taken with us?

1ſt. To ſee how *Sacrifices* are actually us'd *now* in thoſe Parts of the World where they do *Sacrifice*. And being convinc'd that theſe do uſe *outward Sacrifices*, and underſtand the firſt Command to *Sacrifice*, in that ſenſe, to inquire

2dly, Whether they did not receive this from their *Fathers*, ſo upward, to the firſt Inſtitution? And is not this the ſureſt Rule to find out the meaning of the *firſt Command? viz.* How it was *underſtood* and *practis'd* by thoſe to whom the Command was *firſt* given; and from them, through all Ages ſince. Upon all which *Topicks*, the preſent *Water-Baptiſm*, now us'd, may be as much demonſtrated to be the ſame which was *practis'd* by the *Apoſtles*, and conſequently, which was *commanded* by *Chriſt*, as the *outward Sacrifices* can be ſhewn to have been, at firſt, *commanded* to the *Jews*, and *practis'd* by them.

XI. And as for that precarious Plea, before confuted, of the *Baptiſm* which the *Apoſtles* practis'd, being only a Complyance with the *Jews*; there is more *Pretence* to ſay, that the *Jewiſh Sacrifices* were in Complyance with the *Heathen Sacrifices*, which were long before the *Levitical Law*.

I ſay, there is more *Pretence* for this, but not more *Truth*. More *pretence*, becauſe it has been advanced of late, by Men of greater Figure than *Quakers*, That the *Levitical Sacrifices* were commanded by God, in Complyance with the *Gentile Sacrifices*, which were before uſed.

But this is a Subject by it ſelf. I now only ſhew the *Quakers*, that there is more ground to *ſpiritualize* away *Sacrifices* from the *Letter*, than *Baptiſm*; more *pretence* for it from *Texts* of *Scripture*, and from ſome *odd Opinions* of ſome Learned Men.

And if the Denial of OUTWARD *Sacrifices* wou'd be counted (as the like of *Baptiſm* was, when *firſt* ſtarted) to be nothing ſhort of *Madneſs*, the continuance of that *Diſtraction* for 46 Years together (as in the Caſe of *Baptiſm*) might make it more *familiar* to us, but would abate nothing of the *Unreaſonableneſs*.

XII.

XII. I believe the Reader, by this time, cannot but think that I have taken too much needleſs Pains, in Anſwer to that Objection of St. *Paul*'s ſaying that he was not ſent to *Baptize*, but to *Preach*: But I ſpeak to a ſort of Men, who are us'd to *Repetitions*, and will not take a *Hint* (unleſs it be on their ſide) and therefore I enlarge more than I wou'd do, if I were writing to any others. But I think I have ſaid enough, even to them, to ſhew, that the Meaning of the *Apoſtle* in this *Text*, was only to prefer the Office of *Preaching*, before that of *Baptizing*. But I muſt withal deſire them to take notice, that the *Preaching*, that is, *Publiſhing* of the *Goſpel*, at firſt to *Heathens*, was a very different thing, and of much greater *Neceſſity*, than thoſe ſet *Diſcourſes*, which we now call *Preaching* in *Chriſtian* Auditories.

XIII. Let me (to conclude) add one Argument more, from this Text, 1 *Cor.* i. 17. why that *Baptiſm*, mention'd *Matt.* xxviii. 19. cannot be meant of the *Baptiſm with the Holy Ghoſt*. Becauſe if when *Chriſt* ſent his *Apoſtles* to *Baptize*, the meaning was (as the *Quakers* wou'd have it) to *Baptize* with the *Holy Ghoſt*; then the Apoſtle *Paul* ſaid in this *Text*, 1 Cor. i. 17. That he was not *ſent* to *Baptize* with the *Holy Ghoſt*. Which ſenſe, ſince the *Quakers* will not own, they cannot reconcile theſe *Texts*, without confeſſing, that that Text, *Matt.* xxviii. 19. was not meant of the *Baptiſm* with the *Holy Ghoſt*, and then it muſt be meant of the *Water-Baptiſm*.

SECT. VIII.

Objection from 1 Pet. iii. 21.

THE Words of the *Text* are theſe. *The like Figure whereunto (i. e.* the *Ark) even Baptiſm, doth alſo now ſave us, (not the putting away of the Filth of the Fleſh, but the Anſwer of a Good Conſcience towards God) by the Reſurrection of Jeſus Chriſt.*

From whence the *Quakers* argue thus: That *Baptiſm* doth not conſiſt in the *outward Waſhing*, but the *inward*.

And ſo far they argue right, That the *inward* is the *chief* and *principal* part; and therefore, that if any regard only the *outward Waſhing* of the *Skin*, in *Baptiſm*, they are indeed fruſtrated of the whole Benefit of it, which is altogether *Spiritual*.

And it has been obſerv'd *Sect.* VII. latter part of *Numb.* vii. That if only the *outward* Part of the *Sacrifices*, or *Circumciſion*, and other *Inſtitutions* under the *Law*, were regarded, they were *hateful* to *God*, and he *rejected* them; tho', at the ſame time, he commanded the Performance of them, under the Penalty of *Death*.

Thus it is in the *Inſtitutions* of the *Goſpel*. The *Inward* and *Spiritual* Part is the *chief*; and for the ſake of which only, the *Outward* is commanded: But this makes the *Outward* neceſſary, inſtead of throwing it off; becauſe (as it was under the *Law*) the *Outward* was ordained as a *Means* whereby we are made Partakers of the *Inward*: And therefore, if we neglect and deſpiſe the *Outward*, when we may have it, we have no Promiſe in the *Goſpel* to Intitle us to the *Inward*: As he that neglects the *Means*, has no Reaſon to expect the *End*. It is true, a *Miracle* may do it; but it is *Preſumption*, and *Tempting* of *God*, to neglect the *Outward Means* of *God's* Appointment, in expectation of his *Miraculous* Interpoſition, againſt the *Method* which he has commanded. As if *provoking* of *God*, did Intitle us the more to his *Protection!* Or, as if we were *Wiſer* than *He*, to *mend* and *alter* his *Inſtitutions*, and *diſpenſe* with them, at our Pleaſure!

Here let it be minded, that the *Ark* is put only as a *Type* of *Baptiſm*: Therefore *Baptiſm* is the more *worthy*, and more *neceſſary*. And to neglect *Baptiſm*, is to venture *ſwimming* in the *Deluge*, without the *Ark*.

SECT. IX.

The Quaker-Objection from, Eph. iv. 5.

I. THE Words of the Text are theſe. *One Lord, one Faith, one Baptiſm*; whence the *Quakers* argue thus. That *Water-Baptiſm* is one *Baptiſm*, and the *Baptiſm* with the *Holy Ghoſt*, is another *Baptiſm*; becauſe the *one* is the *Outward*, and the other the *Inward* Baptiſm; and *outward* and *inward* are *two* Things: Therefore that theſe muſt be *two* Baptiſms: which, they ſay, is contrary to this *Text*, that ſays, the *Chriſtians* have but ONE *Baptiſm*, as they have but ONE *Lord*, and ONE *Faith*.

II. I Anſwer. *Outward* and *Inward* are *Two* things; but yet they hinder not the *Unity* of *that* which is compos'd of *Both*. Thus *Soul* and *Body* are *Two* things, and of *Natures* the moſt different of any Two things in the World; yet they hinder not the *Unity* of the *Man*, who is compos'd of *Both*. Nay, it is the *Compoſition* of theſe *Two* that makes up the *One* MAN; inſomuch, that when theſe *Two* are *Divided*, the MAN is no more; for it is nothing elſe which we call *Death*, but the *Separation* of *Soul* and *Body*.

And (as before ſhewn, *Sect.* VII. *Num.* VIII.) while there is *Soul* and *Body* in *Man*, there muſt be a *Soul* and *Body* of *Religion*, that is, an *Outward* and an *Inward* Part of *Religion*: And if we deſtroy the *Outward*, we ſhall loſe the *Inward*; becauſe the *Outward* was deſign'd for the Safety and Preſervation of the *Inward*.

It is true, that the *Inward* is the *Chief* and *Principal* Part, as of *Man*, ſo of his *Religion*: But this does not infer, that the *Outward* is not likewiſe neceſſary. We are commanded, *Rom.* xii. 1. to *Preſent our* Bodies *a living Sacrifice*, and this is call'd our *Reaſonable Service*. For, is it not Reaſonable, that, ſince our *Bodies* are *God's* Creatures, as well as our *Souls*, He ſhould have the *Adoration* and *Service* of our *Bodies*, as well as of our *Souls*?

There is no *Outward* or *Publick* WORSHIP but by our *Bodies*; we cannot *otherwiſe* expreſs the INWARD *Devotion* and *Adoration* of our *Minds*.

And this is ſo *Natural*, that whoever has a due *Reverence* and *Awe* of the *Divine Majeſty*, cannot help to Expreſs it *Outwardly*, by the *Adoration* of his *Body*, in his Approaches to *God*, even tho' in *Private*. As our *Bleſſed Saviour*, in His *Agony*, fell *proſtrate* upon *His Face* to the Earth.

And whoever deny the *Outward Worſhip* to *God*, or perform it *ſlovenly*, and *careleſly*, it is a full Demonſtration that they have no *True* and *Real Devotion*, or *Juſt Apprehenſion* of the *Almighty*.

Therefore the *Outward* Part of *Religion* muſt, by no means, be let go, becauſe the *Inward* certainly dies, when the *Outward* is gone.

But the *Outward* and the *Inward* WORSHIP of *God* are not *Two* Worſhips, but only *Two Parts* of the *ſame* Worſhip. As *Soul* and *Body* are not *Two Men*, but *Two Parts* of the *ſame* Man; ſo the Adoration of this *One* Man, *Outwardly* in his *Body*, and *Inwardly* in his *Soul*, is not TWO *Worſhips*, but TWO *Parts* of the SAME *Worſhip*.

III. There is but *one Faith*, yet this *Faith* conſiſts of *ſeveral Parts*. There is a *Faith* in *God*, of which the *Heathens* do partake: There is a *Faith* in *Chriſt*, which denominates Men *Chriſtians*: Yet theſe are not *Two Faiths* in a *Chriſtian*, but TWO *Parts* of the SAME *Faith*. There is likewiſe a *Faith* in the *Promiſes* of the *Goſpel*; and that what is therein *Commanded*, is from *God*: And there are Degrees of this *Faith*, of which one Chriſtian does partake more than another. And yet to *Chriſtians* there is but *One Faith*.

The Belief of a *God*, and of *Chriſt*, are TWO *Faiths* or *Beliefs*, becauſe many do Believe a *God*, who do not Believe in *Chriſt*: Yet, in a *Chriſtian* they are not TWO *Faiths*, but ONE *Faith*; becauſe the *one*, that is, the *Faith* in *Chriſt*, does ſuppoſe the *other*, that is, the *Belief* of a *God*; it only *Adds* to it, and *Builds* upon it. And this makes them no more TWO *Faiths*, than building an Houſe a *Story* higher makes it TWO *Houſes*.

IV. There

IV. There is but *One Lord*, that is *Chriſt*; yet He conſiſts of an *Outward* and an *Inward* Part, of *Body* and *Soul*. Nay more, of both the *Divine* and *Human Natures*. I might urge the different *Perſons* in the *One Divine Nature*; but this will be no Argument to the *Quakers*, who Deny it. But they Deny not (ſeemingly at leaſt) the *Divinity* of *Chriſt*; and therefore, as this *Lord* is but *One*, tho' conſiſting of ſeveral *Natures*; and His *Faith* and *Worſhip* but *One*, tho' conſiſting of ſeveral *Parts*; why may not His *Baptiſm* be likewiſe *One*, tho' conſiſting of an *Outward* and an *Inward* Part?

V. There was an *Outward* and an *Inward* CIRCUMCISION, as well as an *Outward* and *Inward* BAPTISM; yet no Man will ſay, that there were Two *Circumciſions* under the *Law*. As little Reaſon is there to ſay, That there are Two *Baptiſms* under the *Goſpel*. See what is before ſaid, *Sect.* VII. *Num.* X, & XI, of the ſtronger Preſumptions to deny the *Outward* SACRIFICES under the *Law*, than the *Outward* BAPTISM under the *Goſpel*.

VI. Let me add, that *Circumciſion* was diſcontinu'd 40 Years in the Wilderneſs (*Joſh.* v. 5.) yet this was made no Argument againſt the *Reviving* and *Continuance* of it afterwards.

But *Baptiſm* has not been diſcontinu'd *one Year*, nor at all in the *Chriſtian Church*, ſince its firſt Inſtitution by *Chriſt*.

If the *Quakers* cou'd find ſuch a *Diſcontinuance* of *Baptiſm*, as there was of *Circumciſion*, they wou'd make great Advantage of it; tho' it cou'd be no more an Argument in the one caſe, than in the other.

But ſince they have not even this ſmall Pretence againſt it, the *Conſtant* and *Uninterrupted Practice* of *Baptiſm*, in all *Chriſtian Churches*, through *all Ages*, is an Irrefragable Argument againſt them; and ſhews them to be Diſſonant from the whole Church of CHRIST.

SECT.

SECT. X.

An Objection from Heb. vi. 1.

1. I Cou'd not have imagin'd that this ſhou'd have been made an *Objection*, if I had not ſeen it urg'd as ſuch, in a Book printed this Year, 1696. Intituled, *John Baptiſt's Decreaſing*, &c. By *John Gratton*. Where he urges mightily this Text, as a plain Prohibition to the further *Continuance* of *Baptiſm*. He lays great ſtreſs upon the Word *Leaving*. *Therefore Leaving the Principles of the Doctrine of Chriſt, let us go on unto Perfection.* LEAVING (ſaith he, *P.* 45.) *Mark*, LEAVING *the Principles*, &c.' And *Baptiſm* being nam'd in the ſecond Verſe, he infers, That the *Apoſtle* here Commands to *leave off* the Practice of *Baptiſm*, which, he ſays, had been Indulg'd to the firſt *Converts* to *Chriſtianity*, with other *Jewiſh Ceremonies*. As to the ſuppoſed *Indulging* of *Baptiſm*, on account of its being a *Jewiſh Ceremony*, it is anſwer'd before, Sect. VI. Pag. 19, 20, 21. But now as to this Inference from *Heb.* vi. 1. *John Gratton* ſays, *P.* 47. That this word LEAVING *ſeems to entail the foregoing words in the Chapter before, where he* (the Apoſtle) *had been telling them of their Childiſhneſs (he mentions the Doctrine of Baptiſm, which cannot prove the Impoſing of* Water-Baptiſm, *any more than all the reſt) and was now for bringing them on to a further State, where they might know Perfection* ——*And it ſeems clear to me, that there was ſome need for thoſe things, they had ſo long lain like Children weak, and Babes in, to be left.* Therefore leaving theſe, let us go on to Perfection; *and ſaith further*; This will we do, if God permit: *But if they had been commanded by Chriſt, to have been uſed to the World's End, then why ſhou'd* Paul *have been ſo earneſt at that Day, which was ſoon after Chriſt's Aſcenſion, to have had them then to leave them?* Theſe are his words, and a great deal more to the ſame purpoſe. And in the ſame Page, he ranks *Baptiſm* with *Circumciſion*, *Paſſover*, and other *Jewiſh Rites*.

II. But

II. But it is very wonderful, how any Man cou'd ſhut his Eyes ſo hard, as to overſee not only the whole *Scope*, but the very *Words* of this *Text*. Can ſuch a Blindneſs be other than wilful? The *Apoſtle* was reproving ſome of the *Hebrews* for their ſlender Proficiency in the Knowledge of the *Goſpel*. And that he cou'd not lead them to the *Higher Myſteries*, they hardly yet being well fixed in the very *Rudiments* and *Fundamentals* of *Chriſtianity*: As if one ſhou'd ſay, That he would make an ill *Doctor* of *Divinity*, who had not yet learned his *Catechiſm*.

For the *Apoſtle* in the former Chapter having treated of the Myſterious Parallel 'twixt *Chriſt* and *Melchiſedec*, he ſtops ſhort, Ver. 11, upon the account of their Incapacity, *of whom* (that is, of *Chriſt* and *Melchiſedec*) *we have many things to ſay, and hard to be uttered, ſeeing ye are dull of hearing: For when for the time ye ought to be Teachers, ye have need that one teach you again, which be the firſt Principles of the Oracles of God.* Then he goes on to provoke them to a further *Proficiency* in the words of the Text we are now conſidering, *Therefore* (ſays he) *leaving the Principles of the Doctrin of Chriſt, let us go on unto Perfection, not laying again the Foundation of Repentance from dead Works, and of Faith towards God, of the Doctrin of Baptiſms, and of laying on of Hands, and of the Reſurrection of the Dead, and of Eternal Judgment. And this will we do, if God permit.*

Here is the Doctrine of *Baptiſm* placed in the very Heart of the *Fundamentals* of *Chriſtianity*; yet the *Quakers* would filch it out from amongſt all the reſt, and refer *it alone* to the *Ceremonials* of the Law ſpoken of in the former Chapter. This was drop'd at a venture; for the *former Chapter* treats only of the *Melchiſedecal Prieſthood*, which was no Part of the *Law*; and there are none of the *Legal Types* or *Ceremonies* ſo much as mention'd in it. Yet *Baptiſm* in the next *Chapter* muſt refer to them!

There cannot be a greater *Confeſſion* to *Baptiſm* than this *Objection* of the *Quakers*; nor a ſtronger Proof for the *Neceſſity* of it, than to ſee it rank'd with theſe moſt-acknowledg'd *Foundations* of *Chriſtian* Religion, and call'd one of the *Firſt Principles of the Oracles of God.*

III. And

III. And as to the word *Leaving*, upon which this Author lays so great a stress, in this *Text*, as if it meant *Forsaking* and *Abandoning*, it is strange that he should bring in the *Apostle* Exhorting to *Leave off*, and *Forsake* the *Principles* of the *Doctrine* of *Christ!* But *Leaving* there is very plainly meant of *leaving* or *intermitting* (as the *Vulgar* renders it) to *treat* further at that time of these *Principles*, which the *Apostle* is so far from *forsaking*, that he fixes them as the *Foundation*; which he says he will not *lay again*, as supposing it *laid already*; but build further upon it, improve and carry up the *Superstructure*. So that this *Leaving*, is only *leaving* or *ceasing* to *Discourse* further upon these *Principles*, *Intermittentes Sermonem*, *intermitting* or *breaking off* the *Debate*. Which is literally, according to the *Greek* ἀφέντες λόγον, *leaving that Word* or *Subject* of which he then spoke, he went on to discourse of other things.

The Reader could not forgive this Trifling in me, to prove things which are self-evident, if he did not see that I am forc'd to it.

However, this Advantage is gain'd by it, to see the very slender *Foundations* upon which the *Quakers* build their Objections against *Baptism*; which they must either grant to be one of the *Principles* of *Christianity*, or that *Faith* and *Repentance* are not.

IV. But indeed (it is frightful to say it, I pray God they may seriously consider of it) they have, together with *Baptism*, thrown off all the other *Principles* of the *Doctrin* of *Christ*, which are mention'd in this *Text*. 1. *Repentance*. Against this they have set up a *Sinless Perfection*, which needeth no *Repentance*. They never beg Pardon for *Sin*, supposing they have none; and mock at us for saying, *Lord have Mercy upon us*; and upbraid our *Liturgy* for having a *Confession* of *Sin* in it. *Edward Burrough*, p. 32. of his Works, printed 1672, says, That *God doth not accept of any, where there is any failing, or who doth not fulfill the Law, and doth not Answer every Demand of Justice.* 2. *Faith towards God.* This

See The Snake in the Grass, 1*st Part*, or *Preface*, *p.* 313, 314. 2*d Part*, *p.* 40, 41, 61, 62.

This is the *Christian* Faith; or Faith in God through *Christ*. But the *Quakers* say, That they can come to God *Immediately*, without the *Mediation* of *Christ*, and therefore they do not *Pray* to *Christ*, whom they *utterly deny* to be that Person who suffer'd for them upon the Cross; as Mr. *Penn* in his *Serious Apology*, p. 146. *Part* 1. *p* 330, 331.

They make *Christ* to be nothing else than what they call *The Light within*; which, they say, is sufficient of itself, without any thing else, to bring us to God; and that whoever follows it, needs no other Help.

Now they say, That all the *Heathen*, every Man that is born into the World, has this *Light within*, that is, *Christ*; and, that this *Light within* is sufficient for his *Salvation*, without any thing else: Whereby they take away any Necessity of an *Outward Christ* to *dye* for our *Sins*, and make the *Heathen* Faith as good as the *Christian*: And therefore they have taken away that *Christian Faith towards God*, which is the Second of the *Principles* mention'd in this *Text*. The Third is *Baptism*, which they openly disclaim. The Fourth is, the *laying on of Hands*, that is, the *Ordination*, *Confirmation*, and *Absolution* of the *Church*, which are all perform'd by *laying on of Hands*. And how much soever the *Quakers* and others do despise them, yet the *Apostle* here reckons them among the *Fundamentals*: For the *Government* and *Discipline* of the *Church* are *Essential* to it, as it is a *Society*, it could not otherwise be a *Society*. The Sin of *Korah* was nothing but concerning *Church-Government*. And *Aaron*'s *Rod* that Budded, in confirmation of his *Priesthood*, was ordained to be kept for ever in the *Ark*, for a Token against the *Rebels*; so are they call'd, who *Rebel'd* against that *Priesthood* which God had then appointed by *Moses*; and the Sin cannot be less to *Rebel* against that *Priesthood* which *Christ* himself appointed. Which is shewn more at large in the *Discourse* mention'd in the *Advertisement*. Num. 16, & 17 *Ch.*

Now if *Aaron*'s *Rod*, that is, *Church-Government*, was one of the *Three* sacred *Depositums* which were ordain'd to be kept in the *Ark*, why should we wonder to see it here placed among the *Fundamentals* of *Christianity*?

The *Pot of Manna*, *Aaron*'s *Rod*, and the *Tables of the Covenant*, were all that was kept in the *Ark*. Heb. ix. 4.

Which ſhews *Church-Government* to be *Neceſſary* next to our *Manna*, the very Support of our *Life*; and the beſt Guard to preſerve the *Decalogue*, *i. e.* our Duty to *God* and *Man*.

V. And tho' the *Quakers* cry down *Church-Authority* in others, yet they magnifie it as much in themſelves as any *Church* whatſoever.

The Ingenious *W. P.* in his *Judas and the Jews*, writing againſt ſome *Diſſenters* amongſt the *Quakers*, aſſerts the *Authority* of the *Church* very high, and *the Power of the Elders in the Church*, p. 13. and preſſes that Text, *Matth.* xviii. 17. *Tell it unto the Church*, to extend to Matters of *Faith* and *Worſhip*, as well as to Private *Injuries* or *Offences* amongſt *Chriſtians*. *That Chriſt* (ſays he) *as well gave His Church Power to Reject as to Try Spirits, is not hard to prove. That notable Paſſage*, Go, tell the Church, *does it to our hand: For if in caſe of private Offence betwixt Brethren, the Church is made Abſolute Judge, from whom there is no Appeal in this World; how much more in any the leaſt caſe that concerns the* NATURE, BEING, FAITH, *and* WORSHIP *of the Church her ſelf?*

But the Caſe was quite alter'd when he came to Anſwer that ſame *Text*, as urged againſt the *Quakers* by the *Church*; which he does in his *Addreſs to Proteſtants*, p. 152, 153, & 154. of the *Second Edition* in *Octavo*, printed 1692. And then that Text does not relate at all to *Faith* or *Worſhip*, but only to *private Injuries*. For having deny'd the *Authority* of the *Church* in Matters of *Faith*, he puts the Objection thus againſt himſelf: *But what then can be the meaning of Chriſt's Words*, Go, tell the Church? *Very well. I Anſwer* (ſays he, *p.* 153.) *'Tis not about* Faith, *but* Injury, *that Chriſt ſpeaks; and the place explains itſelf, which is this*; Moreover, if thy Brother ſhall TRESPASS againſt THEE, go and tell him his FAULT, between thee and him alone. *Here is* Wrong, *not* Religion; Injuſtice, *not* Faith *or* Conſcience *concern'd; as ſome would have it, to maintain their Church-Power.* ——*The words* TRESPASS *and* FAULT *prove abundantly, that He only meant* Private *and* Perſonal Injuries; *and that not only from the common and undeniable ſignification and uſe of the words* TRESPASS *and* FAULT, *but from the way Chriſt directs and commands for Accommodation*, viz. *That the Perſon wronged ſpeak*

to

to him that commits the Injury, alone; if that will not do, that he take one or two with him: But no man can think, that if it related to FAITH *or* WORSHIP, *I ought to Receive the Judgment of one, or two, or three, for a ſufficient Rule.——Therefore it cannot relate to Matters of* FAITH, *and Scruples of* CONSCIENCE, *but* PERSONAL *and* PRIVATE INJURIES.

Thus he. But tho' the Judgment of *one*, *two*, or *three*, is not of itſelf a *ſufficient Rule*, (none ever ſaid it was) yet may not *one*, *two*, or *three* ADMONISH one another, even in Matters of *Faith* and *Worſhip*, as well as of *Private Injuries*, and, in caſe of *Refractorineſs* and *Obſtinacy*, bring the Cauſe before the *Church? Thou ſhalt in any wiſe Rebuke thy Neighbour, and not ſuffer Sin upon him.* Yet was not the *Judgment* of every Man a *ſufficient Rule* to his Neighbour. And our *Saviour*'s commanding to bring the Cauſe finally before the *Church*, ſhews plainly, that the Judgment of the *one*, *two*, or *three*, was not meant for a *ſufficient Rule*, that is, the *ultimate* Deciſion. Lev. xix. 17.

But in Anſwer to Mr. *Penn*'s Argument, That this Text, *Tell it unto the Church*, was meant only of *Private Injuries*, I ſhall repeat but his own words before quoted, and grant, that as it was meant of *Private Injuries*, ſo, as Mr. *Penn* very well infers, *How much more in any the leaſt Caſe that concerns the* Nature, Being, Faith, *and* Worſhip *of the Church her ſelf?*

VI. But, to return. The *fifth* Article in that Enumeration of *Fundamentals*, Heb. vi. 1, & 2. is, *The Reſurrection of the Dead*; which the *Quakers* do likewiſe deny; as it is fully prov'd in *The Snake in the Graſs*, Par. 2. Sect. 13.

The *laſt* is that of *Eternal Judgment*, which depends upon the former, and may be made one with it; and is likewiſe deny'd by the *Quakers*, that is, turn'd into *Hymeneus* and *Philetus*'s Senſe, of an *Inward* only and *Spiritual Reſurrection*, or *Judgment* perform'd *within* us. I have frequently heard *Quakers* ſay, that they expected no other *Reſurrection* or future *Judgment*, than what they had attain'd already, that is, the *Reſurrection* of *Chriſt*, or *the Light*; and the *Judgment* or *Condemnation* of *Sin*, in their *Hearts*.

George Whitehead, in his Book call'd *The Nature of Chriſtianity*, &c. printed 1671, p. 29, thus ridicules it: *Doſt thou* (ſays he to his Opponent) *look for Chriſt, as the Son of* Mary, *to Appear outwardly, in a Bodily Exiſtence, to ſave thee? If thou doſt, thou mayſt look until thy Eyes drop out, before thou wilt ſee ſuch an Appearance of him.*

And now what Wonder is it, that theſe ſhould throw off *Baptiſm*, who have likewiſe thrown off all the other *Fundamentals*, which are reckon'd with it in this *Text?*

VII. But let us hence obſerve, and beware of *Neglecting* or *Deſpiſing* the *Outward* Inſtitutions of *God*; becauſe theſe depending upon the Authority of *God*, no leſs than the *Inward* and *Spiritual*, rejecting of the one overthrows the *Obligation* and *Sanction* of the whole, and is a rejecting of *God* the *Inſtitutor*; who, in His juſt Judgment, ſuffers thoſe to loſe the one, that think themſelves too good for the other.

Men were made Partakers of Chriſt *to come*, by the *Sacrifices* which were appointed, as *Types* of Him, under the *Law:* So now are we Partakers of Him, *who is come*, by the *Sacraments*, which He has appointed in *Remembrance* of Him, under the *Goſpel*.

And as thoſe who *neglected* or *deſpis'd* the *Sacrifices*, when they might be had, from the *Legal Prieſts*, according to *God*'s Inſtitution, were made liable to *Death*, and did forfeit their *Title* to the Participation of *Chriſt* the *Archi-Type:* So thoſe who *neglect* or *deſpiſe* the *Sacraments* which He has commanded as the *Means* of *Grace*, and of our *Inward* Participation of Him, under the *Goſpel*, do thereby juſtly forfeit their *Title* to ſuch Participation.

For, if we will not take *God*'s Way, we have no *Promiſe* nor *Reaſon* to ſecure us in the following of our *own* Inventions.

SECT.

SECT. XI.

The Quaker-*Objection, That there are no* Signs *under the* Goſpel.

I. THE *Quakers* throw off all *Outward* Inſtitutions, as not only *Uſeleſs*, but *Hurtful* to the *Chriſtian* Religion; which, they pretend, conſiſts not only *chiefly* (which is granted to them) but *ſolely* in the *Inward* and *Spiritual* Part. They ſay, That all *Figures* and *Signs* are *Shadows*; and that when *Chriſt*, who is the *Subſtance*, is come, the others ceaſe of courſe. That they have attain'd to *Chriſt* the *Subſtance*; and therefore theſe *Shadows* are of no uſe to them. That *Baptiſm* and the *Lord's Supper* are ſome of theſe *Shadows*; and theſe were Indulged to the *Early* and *Weak* Chriſtians, but that the *Quakers*, who have ſtronger Participations of the *Spirit*, are got beyond theſe *Beggarly Elements*, &c.

II. This is ſettl'd as a Foundation-Principle, That *no* Figures, *or* Signs, *are perpetual*; *or of Inſtitution, under the Goſpel-Adminiſtration, when Chriſt, who is the Subſtance, is come*; *though their Uſe might have been Indulged to young Converts in Primitive Times.* A Key, &c. by *W. P.* Printed, 1694. *C.* 10. of Water-Baptiſm, and the Supper, *P.* 24.

Anſ. 1. To ſay they were not *Perpetual*, is one thing; but to ſay, That they were not ſo much as *of Inſtitution* under the *Goſpel*, ſeems a ſtrange Aſſertion, when *Chriſt* gave the *Inſtitution* out of his own Mouth, *Matt.* xxviii. 19. *Go Baptize.* And of his *Supper*, ſaid, *This do*, Luk. xxii. 19.

2. The Reaſon why this ſhou'd not be *Perpetual*, is very *Precarious*, to ſuppoſe that the *Holineſs* of any Perſon ſhou'd exempt him from obſerving the *Inſtitutions* of *God*; whereas *Chriſt* himſelf ſubmitted to them, and ſaid, That it *became him to fulfil all Righteouſneſs*, i. e. all the Righteous *Inſtitutions* of *God*. This is the Reaſon which *Chriſt* *Mat.* iii. 15.

gave

gave for his *Baptiſm*; yet the *Quakers* think that their *Holineſs* will excuſe *them* from *Baptiſm*. *Chriſt* ſubmitted to *John*'s *Baptiſm*, ſaying, That we ought to fulfil all God's Inſtitutions: Yet the *Quakers* will not ſubmit to *Chriſt*'s *Baptiſm*, ſaying, That they are got beyond it. All were required to ſubmit to *John*'s Baptiſm, during his *Miniſtry*, becauſe he was ſent from God to Baptize; therefore *Chriſt* alſo ſubmitted unto it; and did receive his own Commiſſion to *Baptize*, by the viſible Deſcent of the *Holy Ghoſt*, upon his receiving the *Baptiſm* of *John*. All are yet more expreſly commanded to receive the *Baptiſm* of *Chriſt*. *Go, Baptize* ALL NATIONS. *Go ye into* ALL THE WORLD, *and Preach the Goſpel to* EVERY CREATURE: *He that Believeth, and is* BAPTIZED, *ſhall be ſaved.* But the *Quakers* and *Muggletonians* excuſe themſelves, as being too *Good* for it; *They truly feeling in themſelves* (as it is expreſſed in the *Key* before quoted, *p.* 26.) *the very Thing, which outward Water, Bread and Wine do ſignifie, they leave them off.* But were they as *Holy* as they pretend, yet wou'd not this excuſe them from obſerving the *Inſtitutions* of *Chriſt*; nay, the greateſt Sign of *Holineſs*, and true *Humility*, is, not to think our ſelves above his *Inſtitutions*, but *obediently* to obſerve them, after the Bleſſed Example of *Chriſt* our *Lord*. And it is the greateſt Inſtance of *Spiritual Pride*, and the moſt *Fatal Deception* in the World, thus to *over-value* our ſelves; it betrays the groſſeſt *Ignorance* of *Spiritual* things: For the more a Man knows of *himſelf*, and of *God*, the more he diſcovers of his own *Weakneſs* and *Unworthineſs*; he appears *leſs* in his own ſight, and frames himſelf the more *Obſequiouſly*, with the moſt profound *Humility* and *Reſignation*, *Dutifully* and *Zealouſly* to obſerve every the *leaſt* Command of *God*. They are *Novices* in the Knowledge of *God*, who are *lifted up with Pride*; and theſe *fall into the Condemnation of the Devil*, 1 Tim. iii. 6.

Mat. xxviii. 19.

Mar. xvi. 15.

And what can be greater *Pride*, than to think our ſelves in an higher Condition of *Perfection*, than the *Holy Apoſtles*, and all thoſe Glorious *Saints* and *Martyrs*, who were the *Firſt-fruits* of the *Goſpel*, called (in the *Key* above quoted) by the *Leſſening* Stile of *Young Converts, in Primitive Times*?

St. *Paul*, though IMMEDIATELY *Converted*, and *Enlightned* MIRACULOUSLY from HEAVEN, was commanded to go to *Ananias*

nias to be *Baptized*. But our *Quakers* paſs him off as a *Young Convert*, they have got *beyond him*, and think themſelves more HIGHLY *Enlightned* than he was: And, for that Reaſon only, not to need that *Baptiſm*, which was thought neceſſary for him.

And all the other *Chriſtians*, from *Chriſt* to *George Fox*, were *Young Converts*! Then it was that a greater *Light* was given than ever was known in the *Church* of *Chriſt* before, to make the *Outward Baptiſm* ceaſe, as of no longer uſe to thoſe who had attain'd the *Subſtance*! Or otherwiſe none of the *Primitive Chriſtians* knew their own *Holineſs*; or were ſo *Humble* as not to own it, to that Degree as to place themſelves above all *outward Ordinances*!

Theſe are the Grounds and Reaſons of the *Quakers*, why *Baptiſm*, and the *Lord's Supper* were not *Perpetual*!

Which, in the mildeſt word that I cou'd frame, I have call'd *Precarious*. And they muſt appear to be ſuch, till the *Quakers* can give ſome other Proof beſides their own ſaying ſo, either that the *Holineſs* of any Perſon can excuſe him from the Obſervance of *Chriſt's Inſtitution*: Or, that they have a *greater Degree* of *Holineſs* than all others ſince *Chriſt*, who have been *Baptized*.

3. But the *Perpetuity* of *Baptiſm*, and *the Lord's Supper*, are fully expreſſed in the Words of the *Scripture*. When *Chriſt* gave Commiſſion to his *Diſciples* to *Baptize*, he promiſed to be with them, in the Execution of that Commiſſion, *even unto the End of the World*, Matt. xxviii. 20. which ſhews, that the Commiſſion was to deſcend after the Death of the *Apoſtles* to whom it was given. And it tells how long; *Alway, even unto the End of the World*. The like *Perpetuity* is annexed to the *Inſtitution* of *the Lord's Supper*, 1 Cor. xi. 26. Till *Chriſt* come again. It was Inſtituted in *Remembrance* of him; and therefore to be continu'd till his *Coming again*.

III. I know the *Quakers* do Interpret this, not of *Chriſt's Outward* and *Perſonal* coming at the *Reſurrection*, which (after *Hymeneus* and *Philetus*, 2 Tim. ii. 18.) they ſay is *paſt already*, that is, *Inwardly perform'd*, by the Spiritual Reſurrection of *Chriſt*, or the *Light* in their *Hearts*. And they ſay, That the

Inſtitution

Institution of the *Lord's Supper* was only to continue till that *Inward Coming*, or forming of *Christ* in our *Hearts*; which they having obtain'd, (as they presume) therefore they *throw off the Outward Supper*.

But was not *Christ* formed in the Hearts of the *Apostles*, to whom *Christ* gave his *Holy Supper*, as much as in the Hearts of the *Quakers* now? Was he not *Come* SPIRITUALLY to *Paul*, after his Conversion? And before his Command, above quoted, of continuing the Practice of *the Lord's Supper*, till his *Coming*?

If they say, That this was only to have it continu'd to those *weaker* Christians, who had not Christ *thoroughly* formed in their Hearts.

First, Who can say, That Christ is *thoroughly* formed in his Heart? May there not be greater and greater *Degrees* of the *Inspiration* of Christ in our Hearts? And can we ever come to the End of it, so as to need no *further* Inspiration, or *Coming* of Christ *within us*? Therefore Christ's *Inward* Coming is *always* to be expected. His *further* and *further Coming* and *Inspiration*.

But if that *Coming*, which the *Quakers* wou'd make to be the Determination of the *Outward Institution* of *the Lord's Supper*, be the *Least Degree* of his Coming, then every *Christian*, nay, according to the *Quakers*, every *Man* in the World, not only is, but always was exempted from the Observation of that *Institution*; because the *Quakers* do own, That every Man in the World has, and ever had *the Light within*, which they make to be *Christ*, at least, an *Influence* and *Inspiration* from *Christ*; and so to be a *Coming*, or *Presence* of his in the *Heart*: And therefore, by this Rule, Christ is *Come* to every Man, in some *Degree* or other: And, if there be not some *stinting*, or *ascertaining* of this *Degree*, then *Christ* was *always* so *Come* to *All*, as to make the *Institution* of the *Lord's Supper* useless, at *all Times*, to *All*. Nay, it was *ended*, before it *began*. For, if his *Inward Coming* does *end* it, it cou'd never *begin*, because he was *always* so *Inwardly Come*.

But if there are some *Degrees* of his *Coming* so *weak* as to need the Help of the *Outward Institution*, to which God has annexed the Promise of his *Grace*, when duly *Administred*, and *Receiv'd*, then these *Degrees* must be known, else those may be depriv'd of

of the Benefit of it, who have moſt need of it: And thoſe are they who think that they need it leaſt.

Secondly, The *Quakers* do not always pretend, all of them, to the ſame *Degrees* of *Perfection* (if there be *Degrees* in *Perfection*) they muſt be ſenſible ſometimes (at leaſt others are) of the many Weakneſſes of ſome of their Number: Why then do they not allow the *Lord's Supper* to thoſe *Weaker* ones? Elſe they muſt ſay, That it was not intended for the *Weak* more than for the *Strong*. And ſo, that the *Inſtitution* and *Practiſe* of it, by *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, was wholly *uſeleſs*, and to *no purpoſe*. And that all thoſe high Things ſaid of it, That it is the *Communion* of the *Body* and *Blood* of *Chriſt*, 1 Cor. x. 16. And *Chriſt's* own Words, *This is my Body*: And therefore, that the receiving it unworthily, is being *Guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord*: That therefore we ſhou'd approach to it, with the greateſt *Reverence* and *Preparation*, to *Examine our ſelves* ſeriouſly and diligently, that we may receive it with pure Hearts and Minds: And the Dreadful Judgments which do attend the *Neglect*, or *Abuſe* of it, not only *ſundry Diſeaſes*, and divers kinds of *Deaths*, but *Damnation*, 1 Cor. xi. from Ver. 27. I ſay all theſe were Words thrown into the Air, of no Meaning, nor Import at all, if the *Quaker* Interpretation be true, which makes nothing at all of *the Lord's Supper*, but renders it wholly *Precarious* and *Inſignificant*, even at the time of its *Inſtitution*; and now to be *hurtful* and *pernicious*, as drawing Men from the *Subſtance*, to meer *Shadows*; for they make of it *no more!*

IV. But I wou'd beſeech them to conſider how much more highly God does value it; and how Material a part of his Religion he does make it: For when St. *Paul* was taught the Faith immediately from Heaven, and not from thoſe who were *Apoſtles* before him (as he tells us, *Gal.* i. 16, 17.) *Chriſt* took care to inſtruct him as to this of *the Lord's Supper* particularly. And he preſſes it upon the *Corinthians*, as having received it from God. *For I have received of the Lord* (ſays he, 1 Cor. xi. 23.) *that which alſo I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jeſus, the ſame Night in which he was Betrayed, took Bread*, &c. and ſo goes on to relate the whole *Inſtitution* of the *Lord's Supper*, and the mighty Conſequences, the Benefits and Advantages of it; the *Exa-*

mination preparatory to it; and the *Vengeance* both *Temporal* and *Eternal*, which was due to the *Contempt* of it.

This ſhews, that *Chriſt* did not Inſtitute this *Holy Sacrament* by Chance. It was the laſt Act of his Life; and his *Dying Bequeſt* to his *Church*; fill'd with all his *Bleſſings*, and carrying with it, to the *Worthy Receivers*, the whole *Merits*, and *Purchaſe* of his *Death* and *Paſſion*, the *Remiſſion* of our *Sins*, and full Title to *Heaven! Brethren, I ſpeak after the Manner of Men*; Gal. iii. 15. *tho' it be but a Man's Teſtament, yet, if it be confirmed, no Man diſannulleth, or addeth thereto.* How much leſs then can any Man take upon him to *diſannul* this *laſt Will* and *Teſtament* of *Chriſt*'s, which he has left to his *Church*; and *Bequeathed* it to her with His *Dying* Breath!

This was the Reaſon that it was not only ſo particularly Recorded by the ſeveral *Evangeliſts* in the *Goſpels*; but when St. *Paul* was taught Immediately from *Heaven*, this moſt Material *Inſtitution* was not forgot, but *Chriſt* Himſelf inſtructed him in it; to ſhew the great Streſs and Value which He laid upon it.

And let this ſuffice, to have ſaid in this place, concerning this other Sacrament of *the Lord's Supper*. Its *Inſtitution* is as Plain and Expreſs as that of *Baptiſm*. And the *Practiſe* of it, in the Days of the *Apoſtles*, and all Ages ſince has been as *Univerſal*. And what has been ſaid of *Baptiſm*, is of Equal Force as to this: And the *Quaker* Arguments againſt this, are upon the ſame Foundation as thoſe againſt *Baptiſm*; only they have not ſo many Objections againſt this: Therefore I have made *Baptiſm* the chief Subject of this Diſcourſe; yet ſo, as likewiſe to Include the *Sacrament* of *the Lord's Supper*. Therefore we will go on to conſider what remains of the preſent Objection (which Militates equally againſt both) that there are no *Signs* under the *Goſpel*.

V. And here let me obſerve,

Firſt, That theſe *Signs* and *Figures* which the *Quakers* make Incompatible to the *Goſpel* State, ought only to be underſtood of the *Signs* and *Figures* in the *Law*, which were ordain'd as *Types* of *Chriſt*. And of theſe it is truly argu'd, That when *Chriſt*, who is the *Subſtance*, is come, they muſt ceaſe of courſe; which Argument the *Quakers* bring againſt the *Signs* and *Figures* which

which *Chriſt* did Inſtitute under the *Goſpel*. But how foreign this is from their purpoſe, let any one judge. For thoſe *Signs* and *Figures* which were appointed by *Chriſt*, cou'd not be *Types* of *Chriſt*; becauſe a *Type* is what goes *before* a Thing, and ſhews it *to come*. And therefore, when that which it *foreſhews* is come, it ceaſes. But, as there were *Types* under the *Law* to *foreſhew* Chriſt's coming in the *Fleſh*, and his *Sacrifice* upon the *Croſs*, which therefore are ceaſed; ſo *Chriſt* has appointed other *Types* to foreſhew his *ſecond coming* to Judge the World; and which therefore muſt laſt till he ſhall ſo come, as the *Types* of his *firſt coming* did laſt, till he did ſo come. The *Sacrifices* under the *Law*, did *præfigure* the *Death of Chriſt*; but the *Sacraments* under the *Goſpel*, were Inſtituted in *Remembrance* of it; as well as for *Types* of our future *Union* with *him* in *Heaven*. Therefore the ſame Reaſon which makes the *Legal Types* to *ceaſe*, does infer, That the *Evangelical Types* muſt *not ceaſe*, till they likewiſe ſhall be *fulfilled*; which will not be till we arrive at *Heaven*. Thus, as they are *Types*. And then,

Secondly, As they are *Remembrances* of what is paſt, they are to laſt as long as the *Remembrance* of that which they *Repreſent* ought to laſt with us. *Chriſt* did not Inſtitute *his Supper*, that we ſhou'd thereby *Remember* his *Death*, a *Day*, or a *Year*, but till his *Coming again*. His *Death* took his *Perſonal* Preſence from us; and therefore till that Return, we muſt continue the *Remembrance*, that is, of his *Abſence*, till the Glorious Return of his *Viſible Body*, which was ſeparated from us by his *Death*.

Thus no advantage can be brought to the *Quaker* Pretences againſt the *Chriſtian Sacraments*, from the *Sacrifices* and other *Signs* or *Figures* under the *Law*.

VI. We come now to Examine, what they ſet up againſt any *Signs* or *Figures* under the *Goſpel*, from another Topick; and that is, That the *Goſpel* is all *Subſtance*, and therefore that there muſt be no *Sign* or *Figure* at all in it.

Anſw. By *Subſtance* here they mean that which is *Inward*, or *Spiritual*, that every thing in the *Goſpel* is *Spiritual*.

But this will overthrow all *outward*, or *Bodily* Worſhip. For that is diſtinguiſhed from *Spiritual*, or *Inward* Worſhip.

And, in one ſenſe, all *Bodily* Worſhip is a *Sign* or *Figure* of the *Inward*, or *Spiritual*; which is the *Principal* and *Subſtantial* Worſhip. Thus *Bowing* the *Knee*, or *Uncovering* the *Head* at *Prayer*, are *Signs* or *Figures* of the *Inward Reverence* and *Devotion* of the *Heart*.

And this the *Quakers* practiſe; therefore, by their own Argument, they have *Signs* and *Figures* as well as others; only they throw off thoſe of *Chriſt*'s Inſtitution, and make new ones of their own.

It is impoſſible to be without *Signs* and *Figures*. For this whole World is a *Figure* of that which is to come. We our ſelves are *Figures* of *God*, being *Images* of him: And what is an *Image* but the *Figure* or *Sign* of a Thing? *Chriſt* is a *Figure* of *God*, being *the Expreſs Image of his Perſon*, Heb. i. 3. And we now have the Knowledge of God *in the Face of Jeſus Chriſt*. *God* is a *Light* Inacceſſible to *Angels*, as well as unto *Men*, without ſome *Medium*: His *Eſſence* cannot be ſeen or known *Immediately*, by any but *Himſelf*. All *Creatures* partake of him in *Signs* and *Figures* of him; each in their ſeveral Degrees; there are *Higher* and more *Noble Figures*; but all are *Figures*. And God has, in all Ages, through the World, Diſpenſed himſelf to Mankind in *Signs* and *Figures*; we cou'd not otherwiſe apprehend Him. *Chriſt* is the moſt *Noble* and *Lively Figure* of *God*: Therefore his Diſpenſation is far beyond all others that went before him. Yet even now, *We ſee through a Glaſs darkly*, 1 Cor. xiii. 12. or, *in a Riddle*; as our *Margent* reads it, ἐν αἰνίγματι, in a *Figure*.

What is *the Bible* that we read, what are *Words* but the *Signatures*, the *Signs* or *Figures* of *Things*? We can ſee the *Eſſence* of no one thing in the World, more than of *God*. And what are all thoſe *Accidents* of *Colour*, *Quantity* and *Quality*, by which we diſtinguiſh Things, but ſo many *Figures*, or *Signs* of them?

So very wild is that Notion, that there muſt be no *Signs* or *Figures* under the *Goſpel*!

It would be much *Truer*, if they had ſaid, That there are nothing elſe but *Signs* and *Figures*: There is nothing elſe without a *Figure* but *God*! For all *Creatures* are *Figures of Him*, *Chriſt*, *the Higheſt*.

But

But have the *Quakers* no *Figures*? *G. Fox* in his *Saul's Errand*, p. 14. ſays, That *Chriſt's Fleſh* is a *Figure*. They call the *Body* of *Chriſt* generally, a *Figure*, a *Vail*, a *Garment*. Then either they have none of it, or they have *Figures*.

Richard Hubberthorn wrote, That *Chriſt's coming in the Fleſh was but a Figure*: He meant of the *Inward* coming of *Chriſt*, or the *Light* in the Heart, which they call the *Subſtance* and the *Myſtery*; of which *Chriſt's Outward coming* in the *Fleſh*, they ſay, was but a *Shadow*, or the *Hiſtory* (to uſe their own words.) *G. Fox* made a great *Myſtery*, or *Figure* of his *Marriage*, which, he ſaid, *Was above the State of the firſt* Adam, *in his Innocency*; *in the State of the ſecond* Adam *that never fell*. He wrote, in one of his General *Epiſtles* to the *Churches*, (which were read, and valu'd by the *Quakers*, more than St. *Paul's*,) That his Marriage was a *Figure* of the *Church coming out of the Wilderneſs*. This, if deny'd, I can Vouch undeniably, but it will not be deny'd, tho' it be not Printed with the reſt of his Epiſtles, but I have it from ſome that read it often. But why was it not Printed? That was a ſad Story. But take it thus. He Marry'd one *Margaret Fell*, a Widdow, of about *Threeſcore* Years of Age; and this *Figure* of the *Church* muſt not be *Barren*; therefore, tho' ſhe was paſt Child-bearing, it was expected, that, as *Sarah*, ſhe ſhou'd miraculouſly Conceive, and bring forth an *Iſaac*; which *G. Fox* promis'd and boaſted of, and ſome that I know have heard him do it, more than once. She was call'd, *The Lamb's Wife*. And it was ſaid amongſt the *Quakers*, That the *Lamb* had now taken his *Wife*, and ſhe wou'd bring forth an *Holy Seed*. And Big ſhe grew, and all things were provided for the *Lying in*; and, he, being perſwaded of it, gave notice to the Churches, as above obſerv'd. But, after long waiting, all prov'd *Abortive*, and the *Figure* was ſpoil'd. And now you may gueſs the Reaſon, why that *Epiſtle* which mention'd this *Figure*, was not *Printed*.

Snake in the Graſs, 1ſt *Part*, *pag.* 208.

2d Part, p. 43.

I wou'd have brought nothing into this Diſcourſe that looks like a *Jeſt*; but they have compelled me. And it may be of uſe to them, to ſhew them, that while they throw off the *Sacraments* of *Chriſt's* Inſtitution, upon the Pretence that there muſt be no *Signs* or *Figures* under the *Goſpel*, they, at the ſame

time

time, make Ridiculous *Signs* and *Figures* of *G. Fox*, and his Fantaſtical *Marriage*; and of ſeveral other things; every thing almoſt among them, is a *Sign* or *Figure* of ſomething to come upon the World. How many of their *Lying Prophets* have call'd themſelves *Signs* to the Men of their Generation, as the *Holy Prophets* were in their Day?

VII. There have been *Outward Signs*, in all the Inſtitutions of Religion, ſince the beginning of the World; as well *before*, as *under* the *Law*, and now under the *Goſpel*. Only they have been *vary'd*, or *Ended* according to what they præfigur'd. Thus thoſe *Signs* which had no further Tendency, than to point out what *Chriſt* did or ſuffer'd upon *Earth*, are *fulfill'd* and therefore *Ended*.

But there were ſome *Signs*, which, though they pointed to *Chriſt* upon *Earth*, had yet a further Tendency: For *Signs* may be appointed to more Ends than one. Thus the Inſtitution of the *Sabbath* was appointed for the Commemoration of God's *Reſt* from the Works of the *Creation*, *Gen.*ii.3. and *Exod.*xx.11. and likewiſe the reſt of the Children of *Iſrael* (who were the *Type* of the *Church*) from their *Captivity* and *Slavery* in *Egypt*, *Deut.* v. 15. (which expreſſes the Servitude of *Sin* and *Hell*) and their final *Reſt* in *Canaan* (the Type of *Heaven*) after their forty Years wandering in the *Wilderneſs*, (which repreſent the Labours of this Life.) But this was not the Ultimate *Reſt*, or *Sabbath*, Heb. iv. 18. *For if* Joſhua *had given them Reſt, then wou'd he not afterward have ſpoken of another Day; there remaineth therefore* σαββατισμὸς, *the keeping of a Sabbath* (which ſignifies *Reſt*) *to the People of God. For he that is entred into his Reſt, he alſo hath ceaſed from his own Works, as God did from his.* Thus *Chriſt*, as he ſuffered the 6th Day of the Week, the ſame Day that *Man* was *created*, and *fell*; ſo, on the ſame Day on which God Reſted from his Work of *Creation*, *viz.* the 7th Day, did *Chriſt* Reſt in his Grave, from his Work of *Redemption*. And there is yet a farther *Reſt* or *Sabbath* beyond this; and that is, the Eternal *Reſt* in *Heaven*, Heb. iv. 11. *Let us labour therefore to enter into that Reſt.*

Now, though ſeveral Significations of the *Sabbath* are already paſt, as the Deliverance out of *Egypt*; the Entrance into *Canaan*;

Canaan; and the *Reſt* of *Chriſt*, in his *Grave*: Yet there being one behind, that is the *Sabbath* of *Heaven*, therefore do we ſtill keep the *Sabbath* as a *Type* of it.

But there is another Reaſon for the Continuance of the *Sabbath*; and that is, That it was not only ordained as a *Type* of Things to come; but as a Commemoration of what was paſt, *viz.* Of *God*'s *Reſt* from his Works of *Creation*. And, by the Alteration of the *Day* of the *Sabbath*, it ſerves likewiſe to us *Chriſtians*, as a Commemoration of the *Reſurrection* of *Chriſt*, and his Conqueſt over the Powers of *Death* and *Hell*. It was the *firſt Day* in which *Light* was created; and *Chriſt* (who is our *True Light*, of which the *Viſible Light* is but a *Shadow*, and was ordain'd as a *Type*) *Aroſe* from the *Dead*, the *ſame Day*; and gave *Light* to thoſe who ſat in *Darkneſs*, and the *Shadow* of *Death*, by the Joyful Tidings of our *Redemption* from *Hell*, and *Eternal Bliſs* in *Heaven*!

Now ſo long as the Works of our *Creation* and *Redemption* are to be kept in Memory, ſo long is the *Sabbath* to continue, as a Commemoration of theſe Ineſtimable Benefits.

And, by the ſame Reaſon, ſo long as we ought to commemorate the *Death* and *Paſſion* of *our Lord*; ſo long ought the *Sacrament* of it to continue; which he Inſtituted in Remembrance of it; and commanded it to be continu'd till his *Coming again*.

Thus you ſee that there are *Signs* under the *Goſpel*; not only the two *Sacraments* of the *Church* (which flowed diſtinctly out of *Chriſt*'s Side, after his *Death*, upon the *Croſs*) but that the *Goſpel* does ſtill retain the *Signs* of *Commemoration*, which have deſcended down to us all the way from the *Creation*: And likewiſe ſuch *Signs* or *Types* as have yet a Proſpect forward, and are not wholly fulfill'd.

And *3dly*, The *Signs* of *Preſent Signification*, as the *outward* Acts of *Worſhip*: To which we are as much, nay more ſtrictly obliged under the *Goſpel*, than they were under the *Law*. As St. *Irenæus* argues, (*adverſ. Hæreſ.* l. 4. c. 34.) That the manner of *Worſhip*, as of *Sacrifices*, is chang'd: but not the *Worſhip* aboliſhed. *Non Genus oblationis Reprobatum eſt, oblationes enim & illic, oblationes autem & hic: Sacrificia in Populo, Sacrificia & in Eccleſia; ſed Species Immutata eſt tantum.* i. e. The

Kind

Kind or *Nature* of the *Offering* is not *Aboliſhed*; for there were *Offerings* under the *Law*, and there are *Offerings* alſo under the *Goſpel*: there were *Sacrifices* among the People of the *Jews*. There are *Sacrifices* likewiſe in the *Church*: but the *Species* or *Manner* of them only is changed, *viz.* That ſome *Sacrifices* under the *Law* were *Bloody*, as Præfiguring the *Death* of *Chriſt*: and therefore that *Sort* or *Manner* of *Sacrificing* is *ceaſed*, becauſe *Fulfill'd* in the *Death* of *Chriſt*: But their *Un-bloody Sacrifices*, and *Oblations*, as of *Tythes*, and other *Offerings* Remain ſtill among *Chriſtians*: and are *Signs*, as much as they were under the *Law*. The *outward Worſhip* of *God* muſt be by Actions *proper* and *ſignificant*. *Nihil enim Otioſum, nec ſine Signo, nec ſine Argumento apud eum.* i. e. *For there is nothing Empty, nor without a Sign, nor without Signification in the Worſhip of God.* And, in the very next words, he applies this to *Tythes*. *Et propter hoc illi quidem Decimas —— And for this reaſon the Jews paid Tythes, viz.* as a *Sign* of their *Dependence* upon *God*, and having Receiv'd All from Him: And in Hopes of their Receiving More from Him. *Sed nos omnia——* But the *Chriſtians*, inſtead of a *Tenth* Part, which the *Jews* gave, Give *All* that they have, becauſe (ſays he) they have a *Better Hope*. And, *ch.* 27. ſhewing how *Chriſt* did *Heighten* the *Law*, as, inſtead of *Adultery*, to forbid *Luſt*; inſtead of *Murder*, to forbid *Anger*; and, inſtead of giving the *Tythe*, commanding to ſell *All*: And this, ſays he, *is not a Diſſolving of the Law, but Enlarging it*. So that no Part of the *Law* is *Deſtroy'd*; and *All* is not *Fulfill'd*; and ſince *All* muſt be *Fulfill'd*, it follows, that what is not yet *Fulfill'd*, muſt yet *Remain*: And Many of the *Signs* in the *Law* not being *Fulfill'd* in *Chriſt's Death*, nor ever to be *Fulfill'd* while we Live upon this Earth, conſequently do *Remain*, and muſt ſo Remain to the End of the World. So that the *Goſpel* has *Signs* as well as the *Law*; and, in Great Part, the ſame *Signs*; with other *Sacramental Signs* added by *Chriſt*, which are thoſe of which we now Treat, *Baptiſm*, and *The Supper* of *The Lord*.

Iren. *ibid.*

Matth. v. 17, 18.

VIII. And let us Reflect, that ever ſince God made *outward* Things, and gave us this *Body*, as the *Soul* does act by the Mediation of the *Body*; ſo has God ordain'd, that his *Gifts* and *Graces*

Graces ſhall be convey'd to us by *Outward Signs* and *Means*.

Chriſt us'd *outward Signs* and *Means* for his *Miraculous Cures*; to ſhew, that tho' the *Vertue* did not come from the *Means*, yet that they were of Uſe, and not to be Deſpiſed.

But why do we ſay, that the *Vertue* does not come from the *Means?* We ſay ſo, when we cannot tell the *Reaſon* and *Manner* how the *Means* work their *Effect*, and can we tell it, in thoſe which we call *Natural* Means? No ſurely, we know only by *Obſervation*, and *Experience*; and what often comes to paſs, we call it *Natural*, as being the common Courſe of Things; not that we know the Reaſon of it, more than of thoſe Occurrences which we call *Miraculous* and *Extraordinary*.

Man doth not live by Bread alone, but by every Word that proceedeth out of the Mouth of God.

Bread has no Vertue of its own to *nouriſh*; but only what it receives from *God*: And if he give his *Vertue* (for it is *His only*) to a *Stone*; or any thing elſe, it will *nouriſh*: And *Bread* will, and does ceaſe to *nouriſh*, when he withdraws his *Bleſſing* from it.

Therefore the *Spittle* of *Chriſt* and the *Clay*, the *Waters* of *Siloam* and *Betheſda*, and the *Brazen-Serpent* had as great Vertue to Cure, when they were Appointed by *God*, as *Bread* has to *nouriſh*; and the Vertue came as much from *Them*, as it does from the *Bread*, in our Daily Food.

Now, if the *Brazen-Serpent*, which was but a *Type* of *Chriſt*, had Vertue to Cure the *Body*; ſhall we deny that the *Bread*, which *Chriſt* bleſſed, for the *Remiſſion* of *Sin*, has Vertue to work that Effect?

He whoſe ſingle *Fiat* made the Worlds, and whoſe Influence gives Power to all Things, and makes them what they are; he ſaid of that *Bleſſed Bread*, THIS IS MY BODY. And his Holy Apoſtle ſaid of it, *The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Chriſt?* And do we doubt, how it works this Effect? Dare we Reject it, becauſe it ſeems ſtrange to us, how it ſhou'd work this Effect, who know as little how our *Daily Bread* does nouriſh our *Bodies?* Do we object our Ignorance how a Man can be *Born* of *Water* and the *Spirit*, who can give as ſhort an Account how we are formed, of a drop of *Water*, in the Womb; and by what Ligaments ſuch different *Na-*

tures as *Soul* and *Body*, are compacted and linked together? How can we pretend to have *Faith* in *Christ*, and yet not believe his *Words*, because of the seeming difficulty to our Understandings (who know nothing) of the *Method* and *Manner*, how He can bring them to pass?

According to our *Faith* it will be unto us. Therefore let us *Humble* our *Souls* greatly, and imitate the *Holy Angels* (far more *Enlightned* than we are) who *vail* their *Faces* before *God*; and presume not to dispute his Commands; or pretend to understand all the *Methods* of his *Power* and *Wisdom* unsearchable! but *desire to look into those Things*, 1 Pet. i. 12. those Glorious *Mysteries* of the *Gospel*, which the *Quakers* despise, as below the *Measure* to which they have attain'd! And the *Principalities and Powers in Heavenly places*, do submit to *learn* the *Manifold Wisdom of God*, Ephes. iii. 10. from that *Church*, which the *Quakers* do *vilifie* and *trample under their feet*; as thinking it uncapable to teach them any thing, or to administer to them the *Sacraments* which *Christ* has commanded.

But because the Dispute will arise which that *Church* is, in the miserable Divisions of *Christendom*, and amongst the various sorts of the Pretenders to it, I have in the Discourse mention'd in the *Advertisement*, I hope, given a plain and sure Rule to guide all *Honest* and *Disinterested* Enquirers, in that most *necessary* and *fundamental* Point.

The

The Concluſion.

Shewing the Neceſſity *of* Water-Baptiſm.

THE Sum of what has been ſaid, concludes in the great Neceſſity there is of *Water-Baptiſm*.

But before I ſay more of it, I will obviate an Objection, which may ariſe from the word *Neceſſary*.

If it be *Abſolutely* Neceſſary, then none can be *ſaved* without it: Which ſort of *Neceſſity* I do not plead for. This is plainly diſtinguiſhed in the *Catechiſm* of *our Church*, where *this*, and the *other Sacrament* (of the *Lord's Supper*) are ſaid to be *Generally* neceſſary to *Salvation*. *Generally*, that is, in the *General* and *Common* Methods which are preſcribed in the *Goſpel*. For no Body will pretend to *Limit* GOD; as if HE cou'd not *ſave* by what *Means* and *Methods* HE pleaſes. But we are ty'd up to thoſe *Rules* which HE has Preſcribed to *Us*: Yet *We* muſt not Tie HIM up to thoſe *Rules*, to which HE has Ty'd *Us*.

But who are they who have Reaſon to expect God's *Extraordinary* Mercies, out of the *Common* Methods of Salvation; and to be made Partakers of the *Inward*, without the *Outward* Baptiſm?

I. Thoſe who being conſcientiouſly concern'd for the *Outward*, yet cannot obtain it, through the Want of a *Miniſter* of *Chriſt*, Lawfully *Ordain'd* to Adminiſter it; as in *Turkey*, *Africa*, &c.

Theſe are under an *Invincible Neceſſity*: And their *Earneſt Deſires* (I doubt not) will be accepted by *God*; and the *Spiritual* Baptiſm be conſer'd upon them, without the *Outward*.

II. Thoſe who have been *Baptiſed* by Perſons, not lawfully *Ordain'd*, and conſequently they have receiv'd *no Baptiſm*, having receiv'd it from thoſe who had no Commiſſion to *Adminiſter*

ster it; but who were Guilty of the Higheſt *Sacrilege*, in Uſurping ſuch a Sacred Commiſſion, not Lawfully Deriv'd to them by a *Succeſſive Ordination* from the *Apoſtles*: But yet, through a General Corruption of the Times, ſuch *Baptiſms* are ſuffer'd to paſs, whereby the Perſons ſo *Baptized*, ſwiming down the Stream, do think their *Baptiſm* to be valid, and therefore ſeek not for a *Re-Baptization* from thoſe who are truly Empowred to Adminiſter it. I ſay, Where no ſuch *Re-Baptization* is taught, and thereby the People know nothing of it; in ſuch Caſe, their *Ignorance* is, in a Manner, *Invincible*; and their *Sincerity* and *Devotion* in Receiving *No Sacraments*, yet thinking them *True Sacraments*, may be Accepted by *God*, and the *Inward Grace* confer'd, and the *Defects* in the *Outward* and *Viſible Signs* may be *Pardon'd*.

But neither of theſe Caſes does reach thoſe, who *neglect* the *Outward Means*, upon Pretence of *Inward Perfection* without them. Theſe *Deſpiſe* the *Ordinance* of *Chriſt*, and make themſelves *Wiſer* than *He*; as if *He* had appointed *Means* either *Unneceſſary*, or *Ineffectual* to the *Ends* for which they were intended!

And I deſire theſe to conſider the *Great Neceſſity* there is for *Water-Baptiſm*, as before Explain'd.

1. Becauſe it is ordain'd as the *Means* whereby the *Inward Baptiſm* of the *Holy-Ghoſt* is given, as I before quoted, *Acts* ii. 38. *Be* BAPTIZED, *and ye ſhall Receive the Gift of the* HOLY GHOST. By *This Baptiſm*, cou'd not be meant the *Baptiſm* with the *Holy Ghoſt*, becauſe *This Baptiſm* is Here propoſed as the *Means* whereby to Receive the *Inward Baptiſm* of the *Holy Ghoſt*.

Again, *Epheſ.* v. 26. *That He* (Chriſt) *might Sanctifie and Cleanſe it* (the Church) *with the Waſhing of Water, by the Word.* Here the *Waſhing* of *Water* is the *Means*, tho' the *Operation* and *Vertue* is from the *Word*: And therefore the *Outward Waſhing* or *Baptizing* (which means the ſame, as before told, *Sect.* 1.) cannot be the ſame with the *Word* in this *Text*.

2. *Chriſt* having appointed this as the *Means*, you ſee what *Streſs* He lays upon it, and how *Neceſſary* He makes it.

John iii. 5. *Except a Man be Born of Water and the Spirit, he cannot Enter into the Kingdom of God.* Here the *Water* and the

the *Spirit* are plainly Distinguished, and *Both* made *Necessary* to *Salvation*, the *Outward* as well as the *Inward*: As it is written, *Rom.* x. 10. *For with the Heart Man Believeth, unto Righteousness; And with the Mouth Confession is made unto Salvation.* The Belief of the Heart is *Necessary* unto *Righteousness*, *i.e.* to make Us *Righteous* before *God*: But the *Outward Confession* of the *Mouth* is likewise as *Necessary* to our *Salvation*. As *Christ* said, (*Matt.* x. 32.) *Whosoever shall Confess me before Men*, &c. We must *Outwardly*, and *before Men*, Confess to Christ, by the Due Performance of His *Outward Ordinances*; without which our *Inward Belief* in Him will not be sufficient to our *Salvation*. *Baptism* is an *Outward Badge* of *Christianity*, by being the *Outward Form*, appointed to admit Men as *Members* of the *Church* of *Christ*; and whereby they own themselves to be such, *before Men*: But those who will not wear this *BADGE*, as a *Confession* to *Christ*, before *Men*; *Christ* will not *Confess* them, before His *Father*, in *Heaven*.

Mark xvi. 16. *He that Believeth and is Baptized, shall be Saved.* Here both the *Outward* and the *Inward* are join'd together, and both made *Necessary*; For, by *Baptism*, Here, cannot be meant the *Inward Belief*, that wou'd make a Tautology of the *Text*, and mean thus, *He that Believeth and Believeth* —— Thus it must be, if by *Baptism*, in this Text, the *Inward Baptism*, or *Belief* of the *Heart* be meant. But this being plainly meant of the *Outward Baptism*, the Consequeuce from this Text is plainly this, That *he who doth not Believe, and is not* Baptized, *shall not be Saved*. Of which I adjure the *Quakers* to Consider most seriously: For tho' they had the *Inward Baptism* as much as they Pretend to it, yet were the *Outward* necessary. *Peter* thought *Water* necessary to give *Outward Baptism* to those who had already Received the *Inward Baptism* of the *Holy Ghost*, Acts x. 47.

And the *Doctrine of Baptism* is reckon'd among the *Principles* and *Foundations* of *Christianity*, together with *Faith* and *Repentance*, &c. *Heb.* VI. 1, 2.

But the *Quakers*, like *Naaman*, flout at the *Means*, as too *easie* to be *effectual*; and call *Baptism*, in contempt, *Water-Sprinkling*, And I will answer them with *Naaman*'s Servants, (2 *Kings* V. 13.) *If Christ had bid thee do some great thing, wouldst*

wouldſt thou not have done it? How much rather then when He ſaith to thee, Waſh and be Clean? And as *neceſſary* as the *Waters* of *Jordan* were to the *Cleanſing* of *Naaman*, ſo *neceſſary* are the *Waters* of *Baptiſm* to the *Cleanſing* of our *Souls*. None dare ſay, that GOD cou'd not have Cleanſed *Naaman* otherwiſe: But GOD having, by his *Prophet*, appointed that Means, if *Naaman* had neglected it, he had not otherwiſe been Cured. How much more, when GOD has appointed the Means of *Baptiſm*, by his *Son*, if we *Neglect* it, ſhall we be *Sav'd* without it? *He that Deſpis'd* Moſes's *Law, dyed without Mercy: Of how much ſorer Puniſhment, ſuppoſe ye, ſhall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the* Inſtitution *of the Son of GOD, and counted it an unholy thing, doing Deſpite to it,* Inventing *Contemptible Names* for it, and *Ridiculing* the *Adminiſtration* of it? But as the *Spirit* of *God moved*, at firſt, *upon the Face of the Waters* (Gen. 1. 2.) to *Impregnate* them, and make them *Fructifie*; and gave a *Miraculous* Vertue to the *Waters* of *Jordan*, of *Siloam*, and *Bethesda*, for Healing of the *Fleſh*; Why ſhou'd we Doubt that the ſame *Spirit* can and will *Sanctifie* the *Waters* of *Baptiſm* to the *Myſtical Waſhing away of Sin*, having the Poſitive *Inſtitution* and *Promiſe* of *Chriſt* for it? *Acts* II. 38. *Repent and be Baptized, every one of you, in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt, for the Remiſſion of Sins, and ye ſhall Receive the Gift of the Holy Ghoſt.*

This was not the *Extraordinary Gift* of *Miracles*, which is here Promiſed, (and which all *Baptized* Perſons did not *Receive* or *Expect*) but the *Remiſſion of Sins*. And let me add, That the *Ordinary Saving Graces* of the *Spirit*, which work *ſilently*, without *Obſervation* or *Show*, are much Preferable, and more Deſirable, than the *Extraordinary Gift* of *Miracles*, which, for a time, were Neceſſary, at the firſt Propagation of the *Goſpel*; and held Men's Eyes in Great Admiration: But were of Dangerous Conſequence to the Poſſeſſors, and a *Temptation* often to *Vanity*; which had almoſt over-ſet the Great *Apoſtle*, 2 Cor. xii. 7, 8, 9. and threw others into the Pit of Deſtruction, *Matth.* vii. 22, 23. 1 *Cor.* xiii. 2. and therefore were not to be *Pray'd* for, or *Deſir'd*: We muſt be totally *Paſſive* in this Caſe; and when ſent, being for the Conviction of others, to Receive ſuch an *Extraordinary Gift*, with *Fear* and *Trembling*, leſt it Hurt

our

our *weak Minds*, not capable, but by as *Extraordinary* an Aſſiſtance of *Divine Grace*, to Bear ſuch mighty *Revelations*, and not to let in with it a ſecret *Pride* in our ſelves; which ſpreads our *Sails* ſo wide, that without a Proportionable *Ballaſt* of deep *Humility*, we ſhall be driven from our *Compaſs*. The Enemy throws in this ſtrong *Temptation*, with thoſe *Miraculous Gifts*; which *vain* Men do *Ignorantly* Covet, and ſome falſly *Pretend* to, to their own *Deſtruction*. But much more *Valuable* are thoſe Saving *Graces*, which we are commanded Daily to *Pray* for, and Daily to *Endeavour*: Much more *Available* to us, and *Precious* in the ſight of God, than all *Miraculous Gifts*, is that *Gift* of *The Holy Ghoſt*, the *Remiſſion of Sins*, which is Promis'd to the Due Reception of *Baptiſm*, and enrolls our *Names* in Heaven. *Behold* (ſaid *Chriſt* to his *Diſciples*, who *Boaſted*, that *even the Devils were ſubject to them, through His Name*) *I give unto you Power to tread on Serpents and Scorpions, and over all the Power of the Enemy; and nothing ſhall, by any means, hurt you; notwithſtanding in this Rejoice not, that the Spirits are ſubject unto you; But rather Rejoice, becauſe your Names are written in Heaven.* Luk. x. 17, 18, 19, 20.

To be added to the End of Sect. VIII. p. 34.

But *R. Barclay* argues in his *Apology*, That the *Baptiſm*, of which the *Ark* was a *Type*, cou'd not be the *Outward*, or *Water-Baptiſm*, becauſe that it ſelf is a *Type*, *viz.* Of the *Inward* or *Spiritual* Baptiſm. And he ſupports this Notion by a *Criticiſm* upon the Word Ἀντίτυπα, in this Text, which he ſays is not rightly Tranſlated in our *Engliſh* by *The like Figure*. Becauſe, he ſays, the Word Ἀντίτυπος ſignifies the thing *Typify'd*, and not the *Type*.

But, by his leave, it ſignifies the quite contrary. *Heb.* ix. 24. not the thing *Typify'd*, but only the *Type*: For there the *Holy Places made with Hands* are call'd the Ἀντίτυπα, the *Figures* or *Types* of the *True*. And that Word is not to be found, except in theſe two Texts, in the whole New Teſtament. And there-

fore

fore if one of these Texts must explain the other, the Word Ἀντίτυπος, or *Anti-Type*, 1 *Pet.* iii. 21. must be taken in the same Sense, in which it is used, *Heb.* ix. 24. because there it cannot possibly be taken to mean the thing *Typify'd*, or the *Archi-Type*; therefore neither ought it to be so strain'd, as *Barclay* does, to mean the quite contrary, in the present Text. And our Translation is Justify'd, which renders Ἀντίτυπα *the like Figure*, as does the *Vulgar*, *Similis forma*. For both the *Waters* of the *Ark*, and of *Baptism*, are the *outward* and *visible Signs*, but not the thing *signify'd*, which is the *Salvation* of the *Soul*, by the *Re-generation* and *Washing* of the *Spirit*. And they are like *Figures*, both signifying the same thing, in a manner very *like* to one another. That as *Noah*, &c. were sav'd in the *Ark* by *Water* from *Corporal Death*, so are the True Believers sav'd by the *Water* of *Baptism*, from the *Death* of *Sin* and *Hell*. In which Sense the *Ark* was a *Type* of the *outward* or *Water-Baptism*, tho' both were *Types*, but one nearer than the other. And because the *Baptism* mentioned in this Text, 1 *Pet.* iii. 21. is an Ἀντίτυπος, a *Type* or *Figure*; therefore it must be the *Outward* and *Water-Baptism*, which is here meant. For the *Inward* and *Spiritual Baptism* is not the *Type* or *Figure*, but the thing *signify'd*. And thus *Rob. Barclay*'s Argument and *Criticism* has turn'd into a full Demonstration of the direct contrary of that for which he brought it: And has thoroughly Established the *Divine Institution* of the *Outward* or *Water-Baptism*.

July 17.
1696.

F I N I S.